

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1875.

## The Week.

FROM the exposure of the whiskey frauds perpetrated in St. Louis and other Western cities, as given by the *Tribune*, it seems that for a number of years a Ring of distillers and rectifiers have, in collusion with an unascertained number of employees of the revenue, been defrauding the Government of about a million a year. There is nothing very surprising about there being plenty of people ready to engage in the illicit manufacture of whiskey, but some of the facts connected with the discovery of the frauds by Mr. Bristow, and his measures to put a stop to them, are indeed remarkable. The existence of the Ring was communicated to him in the first place, not by any member of the force employed by the Government for such purposes, but by a St. Louis editor, and the case in that city was "worked up" by an agent selected by the latter. In Washington, the great point on which everything hinged was that, whatever happened, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue should not suspect that a movement of any kind was on foot, not because he was dishonest, but because the Department was so honeycombed by the Ring that news of any hostile movement undertaken by it was sure to be communicated to the Ring. The arrangements for conveying intelligence were so complete that, even as it was, before the St. Louis agent had received his appointment a man had appeared in Washington and had interviews both with the Secretary and the Commissioner, for the purpose of finding out what was going on. The influence and political power possessed by the Ring were shown by the revocation of an order transferring all supervisors and special agents all over the country to new posts. This order was issued by direction of the President a good while ago, after consultation with the Commissioner and Secretary, they all being agreed that a screw was loose somewhere, and actually revoked by him subsequently—no doubt on representations as to the welfare of the party by "prominent men." All this shows the very complex nature of the obstacles thrown in the way of an honest Secretary of the Treasury, and the wonderful perfection to which the arts of corruption have been carried.

The most gratifying thing about the discovery of these frauds is that it is no mere exposure by unauthorized persons of half-real and half-imaginary facts, but consists in the most complete and overwhelming accumulation of evidence, with names, amounts, and dates. We may say also that it gives us a good deal of satisfaction to reflect that the agent appointed to carry out the work of detection, and who did it with great thoroughness and a skill which internal-revenue officers do not appear as a general thing to possess, was a member of that reckless and abandoned class, the journalists—he being no other than the financial editor of the St. Louis *Democrat*; and that the person who gave the information upon which the Secretary of the Treasury acted was his employer, the editor of that sheet. This can hardly be considered regular journalistic work, but Mr. Bristow was certainly fortunate in having it done. The press of this country has done a great work in the last ten years in arousing the public mind and conscience to a sense of the corruption of the times, and has received a great deal of abuse for doing so. It has pointed out particularly that the civil service was rotten; and so this case and a good many others have proved it to be. The newspapers, however, cannot be expected to undertake, as a regular thing, to collect the revenue for the Government. We shall watch with curiosity and interest to see who will be the next person to advise the President not to mind "what the newspapers say."

Mr. Wheeler, of the Louisiana Committee, who arranged the compromise which goes by his name, has satisfactorily settled all questions as to the good faith of the Conservatives by publishing a letter giving the facts. He says that there was no bad faith shown in unseating the four members after the adoption of the compromise; that the Democrats were right in doing it; and that he received notice from them long ago that it would be done. The facts as he gives them are these: After the expulsion of the Democrats by the troops in January, the Republicans unseated four Democratic members who had received certificates from the Returning Board, and as to whose election there was really no question, putting in four Republicans in their place. The case of these four members did not come within the scope of the Committee's enquiry, and the award did not touch them. Therefore, as soon as the compromise was accepted, these four men were re-seated. Mr. Wheeler, whose letter is full of good sense, strongly deprecates the heated accusations brought against the Conservatives by Northern Republicans, and he points out that the great merit of the compromise is that under it, for the first time in years, the State has a government "admitted and recognized by the people." He says that the change for the better which has manifested itself in Louisiana affairs in the last few months is very marked, and that evidences of returning prosperity are to be seen on every side.

When Professor Marsh made his statement before the Board of Indian Commissioners, he must have known that he was disturbing a hornet's nest and might expect a good deal of angry buzzing as well as attempts to sting. He therefore was probably not surprised that even a Congressional delegate from one of the Territories should endeavor to break the force of his testimony by denying the veracity of Red Cloud. But if Professor Marsh was not surprised, it is quite likely that the delegate will be very much astonished when he reads the Professor's cool assertion, in a recently-published letter, that even if "Red Cloud occasionally draws a long bow," nevertheless, "in a question between Red Cloud and the Indian Ring, where both were interested, I should decidedly prefer the testimony of Red Cloud," supposing the testimony to agree with his own observations. The letter also contains additional evidence of the poor quality of the cattle furnished the Indians and of the insufficiency of their food and clothing; and the evidence is backed by the names of several army officers from whom information was received, one of the officers stating that "the poor wretches have been several times this winter on the verge of starvation through the rascality of the Indian Ring. They have been compelled to eat dogs, wolves, and ponies." The Professor attempts no answer to the statement that the agent at the Red Cloud Agency is very kind to the Indians, further than to say that the Indians certainly came near being killed by this kindness, and then adds: "What Indians need is not so much kindness as justice and firmness—qualities which are apparently wanting at the Red Cloud Agency."

The loss of the *Schiller*, last Friday, on the Scilly Islands will probably need a very close investigation before we can say exactly on whose shoulders the blame for so awful a calamity should rest. The captain has gone down with his ship, and is universally admitted to have behaved with all the bravery and coolness possible after the vessel struck; whether there was any negligence in not keeping a proper watch for the fog-bell, which, according to the telegrams, was "not heard," is another question, as is also how the vessel came, in bad weather and with the sea rising, to be close upon some of the worst and at the same time best-known reefs on the English coast. When we remember that an accident of exactly the same kind occurred on this side of the water not very long ago, and also that there is one line of steamers on which, for some reason

or other, no loss of life ever occurs, we are forced to the conclusion that there is a great deal of the grossest kind of negligence and incapacity in the management of a business which is by no means necessarily less safe than that of transporting passengers by land. The only valuable suggestion of a practical remedy has been made by the *Tribune*—we mean that of holding the steamship companies pecuniarily responsible for every passenger they lose or injure by negligence. The statutes which have been passed on this subject with regard to railroads have had a most beneficial effect, and we can see no reason why they should not have an equally good effect on ocean companies. Criminal statutes would be of very little use, because in any bad accident some of the most important witnesses are apt to be lost with the others, and, besides this, the punishment of the officers is not felt by the company. The pocket is the centre of the nervous system of a company, and if every one of these accidents entailed a heavy loss on the owners, we should hear of fewer cases.

For the press the week has been, on the whole, an unusually happy one. No editor has been subpoenaed to Washington that he might be tried there for libel, nor has any bench-warrant issued out of the Supreme Court; while the retirement of Mr. Williams from the Attorney-General's office and the appearance on the scene of Mr. Pierpont make it pretty certain that less time will be devoted by the courts to the protection of the character of Mr. Shepherd in the future. Besides this, the verdict in the case of Phelps against Bowles will no doubt do a great deal to open the eyes of people—if there are any such left—who believe that all would be well if only the "floodgates of calumny," as Mr. Williams calls them, could be closed. The torrent of calumny kept flowing by Mr. Bowles, of the *Springfield Republican*, was turned by him some time since in the direction of Mr. Willis Phelps, a railroad contractor, active in Springfield politics. The *Republican* recklessly and injuriously declared that Mr. Phelps was corrupting the politics of the city, tampering with the purity of elections, carrying them indeed by aid of ballot-stuffers or repeaters; that he, being a rich man, was using his money to get money fraudulently out of the public; and that, in short, Mr. Phelps was the "Boss Tweed of Springfield." This was too much for human endurance, and so Mr. Phelps avowed his determination to put a stop to the thing at once, and brought an action against Mr. Bowles for \$200,000. The case was not tried by a jury, but by a judge of the Supreme Court who has the reputation, we believe, of being extremely able. Before him Mr. Bowles went, refused to pay anything, and, to the amazement and chagrin of Mr. Phelps, substantially proved all the charges he had made. The court, considering that on one of the charges Mr. Phelps was entitled to a verdict, gave him a hundred dollars. The result of this suit ought to be an awful warning to all persons of shaky reputation who think of suing newspapers. If any one contemplates proceedings of this kind and is in doubt whether his reputation is or is not shaky, we should advise him in all cases to settle the doubt in his own favor by not bringing the suit; the chances are that there will probably be not enough of his reputation left at the end of the trial to be worth having.

The outflow of specie is now at full tide, the exports during the past week having amounted to \$3,670,352, making the total since January 1 \$26,620,327—the largest amount on record. The nearest approach to this total was in 1871, when the figures were \$25,143,055, and in 1868, when they were \$25,803,848. Last year we had, up to this time in the year, sent out only \$13,229,608, and in 1873 \$18,238,097. The chief cause of this heavy drain is the calling in by the Treasury of so many five-twenty bonds. If the European holders of these bonds were taking, in equal amount, the new Fives, or, for that matter, any other kind of American securities, of course there would be no necessity for sending gold to Europe to pay for them. Unless there is a renewed demand in Europe for our securities, an unusually heavy drain of specie from

us during the summer is inevitable. The fear of a war in Europe has within the past week shown itself in the foreign money markets, and there is less reason than a week ago to expect that we shall be able to negotiate many securities in Europe this summer. During this month there are subscriptions to American loans falling due in London to the amount of only £280,000; last year the May subscription payments on the same account were £1,753,750. Naturally, therefore, there is little foreign exchange offering in this market, except such as is made against the export of coin. The New York banks now hold about \$10,100,000 specie, and of this they gained \$580,000 during the week—the Treasury, in addition to its heavy disbursements, having sold \$1,500,000 on Thursday. Last year the banks held \$27,300,000 specie. In legal-tender notes, however, the banks are exceptionally strong; they now hold \$58,000,000, which is more than they have reported since last November, and is about \$1,500,000 more than they held last May. These facts point to a low and easy money market during the summer, and to a possibly stringent money market next autumn, when the legal-tender notes will be wanted in the interior, and the bank reserves will be dependent on whatever specie the banks have. General trade during the week has been dull. In Wall Street, general speculation has been quiet, with the exception of an active bear movement in Erie. For all classes of investments there is a continued strong demand, owing mainly to the difficulty experienced in employing money profitably outside of securities. The New York banks have during the week taken about \$5,000,000 of the city revenue bonds. These bonds are issued by the Comptroller to anticipate the collection of taxes already levied; they will be paid off in the late autumn, and bear five per cent. interest.

The Legislative Committee on the Canals has made its first report, and the Removal Bill has been defeated. The report has attracted very little attention, chiefly because the Governor's Commission is the only committee to which the public really looks for information on the subject, and also because the popular interest which was excited by the exposure is wearing out, and most people think they already are possessed of sufficient information as to the canals to be able to converse intelligently about "unbalanced bids," "slope" and "vertical" walls, to have an opinion upon the merits of Mr. Tilden as a Presidential candidate, and so on. We are sorry that this should be so; for the decline of popular interest deprives the Governor of a good deal of moral support, which he needs so much, and strengthens "Jarvis" Lord and his fellows in their belief that, if only they can get time enough, they will carry the day and keep possession of the contracts they plunder the State with. Still, it is an inevitable phase of any reform movement; and popular excitement on the subject even of gigantic frauds cannot be expected to be of any great permanence. What we do expect, however, and what it is essential that we should have sooner or later, is some power to deal with the canals lodged in responsible hands not elected to office nor owing their appointment to any such misty body as the "people," or else the State should cut loose from the canals altogether, and dispose of them. This cannot be done, we suppose, without a constitutional amendment, and meanwhile we must have the canals at any rate taken away from the reach of the legislature, on the members of which they seem to have almost as bad an effect as the jingling of money has on a pickpocket.

Mr. Bowen took the stand last week in the Beecher trial as one of the plaintiff's witnesses in rebuttal, and would have made the mark we predicted for him in that rôle if more latitude had been allowed him or if his memory had served him better on the cross-examination. He contradicted Mr. Beecher in several important particulars—so important that, if his word had commonly the weight of Scripture, the defendant's case would have been irreparably damaged, at least in the opinion of the public. What his reputation is was indicated by Mr. Evans's manner toward him, which was unusually harsh, and almost as if inspired by personal experi-



ence of Mr. Bowen's character. The point on which we had hoped the latter would shed some light was the true nature of the Tripartite Covenant; but his assertion that it had nothing to do with the arbitration of Tilton's money-claims against him is opposed both to the previous testimony and to the probabilities of the case. On the whole, his evidence could not be called ingenuous, though this might not have been apparent to the jury. His kind of moral obliquity exacts considerable study from those who encounter it for the first time; and we can never admire sufficiently the sympathetic appreciation of it shown by Mr. Samuel Wilkeson in framing Bowen's affirmation in the Covenant. It was so like this good man's own composition, it so anticipated the disingenuous defence of himself to which he would naturally resort when cornered, that it must have made him almost blush to read it fresh from Mr. Wilkeson's hand. That Mr. Beecher could, without blushing, put his name to the same paper has always seemed to us one of the least excusable of his acts in all this unmanly business.

A great deal has been said in the Kenealy debates on the subject of the "Prittlewell" petition—a petition in aid of Dr. Kenealy's attack on "caste," which came from a place called Prittlewell, with fourteen hundred signatures. This seemed to prove a tremendous excitement on behalf of the Claimant in Prittlewell, as did also the existence of a "Magna Charta Association," interested in the same cause and having its headquarters in Prittlewell; for it is a small place, and not much accustomed to getting excited about anything. To discover the exact extent of the popular feeling on the subject, a correspondent of the *Daily News* made a tour of inspection, and found, as he informs that paper, no traces of any sentiment whatever:

"The water-carrier who sells water from the old priory well at a farthing a pailful was going about with his old cask drawn by two long-tailed donkeys just as usual. The smith was at work in his smithy behind the old walnut-tree; the Primitive Methodists' preaching-room was being scrubbed out in a leisurely way; and at the door of the 'Peculiar People's Chapel' there was an old man consoling himself for an unmistakable touch of the east about the wind by enjoying the sunshine in a sheltered corner. But where were the banners and flags? Where were the committee-rooms? What had become of the Prittlewell Magna Charta Association—if such an institution ever existed?"

Not even in the public-houses could this correspondent discover anybody who knew or cared anything about Dr. Kenealy or the Claimant, except that if any one wanted information on that head he must "go and ask Mr. Howard." This Mr. Howard turned out to be a small grocer, who had "organized" the Prittlewell petition himself, got the signatures, and without committees or societies or associations of any kind had been fighting, in his own proper person—with the assistance of fourteen hundred obliging persons who gave him "the use of their names," apparently merely because he asked them to—the entire aristocracy of Great Britain. This seems to show that petitions for a redress of grievances may be got up in England much as they can be here.

An extraordinary balloon ascension recently made in France has attracted, both there and in England, a good deal of notice. The French Aeronautical Society appears to have organized it, and three aeronauts were found ready to risk their lives in an attempt to go up as high as possible, with somewhat vague scientific objects in view, or, at any rate, with a somewhat vague notion of how far scientific studies could be carried on during an aerial voyage at a distance of two or three miles from the earth. One of them, on starting, observed that he of the three who should return would be a fortunate man—and this gloomy anticipation was fulfilled to the letter, one only of the three returning to the earth alive. Few precautions seem to have been taken by the balloonists as to their physical condition, one of them having had little or no sleep for three nights, and another having taken only a cup of coffee before starting. At four o'clock in the afternoon the balloon came down, bringing with it two corpses and one man half alive to tell the story of the expedition. The balloon had gone up very high—several miles

—into regions of the atmosphere in which breathing was an impossibility, and, the artificial means provided not proving sufficient for the purpose, the men died. The scientific results do not appear to amount to anything more than what we knew before—that if the air is rarefied enough, human life cannot be supported by it. We must mention also that some of the inhabitants of the village of Courmenin, who had no connection with the balloon and no interest in the scientific results, came very near being killed by the falling through the air of "an iron instrument of circular form," which was nothing else than the *aspirateur* of the aeronauts, thrown out as ballast. What is commonly used as ballast by balloonists we do not know, but in a crisis anything may be, and it is not at all pleasant to think that the ordinary dangers of life on land and sea are likely to be increased, should ballooning become general, by the chance of being suddenly killed or maimed for life by *aspirateurs*, spectroscopes, empty boxes, stones, or other kinds of ballast thrown out by balloonists in difficulties. At common law, rolling a stone off the top of a house into a crowd, and thereby causing the death of some one, would be murder in the first degree; but the legal responsibility created by dropping an *aspirateur* on the head of some inoffensive person from an altitude of eight thousand metres, has, we believe, never been settled. To complete the account of the ascent of the Zenith, it is only necessary to add that the occasion of the death of the two unfortunate men (who happened to be Republicans) was improved for political purposes, one of the orators at the funeral dwelling upon their courage and self-sacrifice as a renewed proof of the qualities possessed by members of that party.

There is no doubt that the Pope is infallible, but that he is not invariable has for some years been amusingly manifest. He has a weak side for Italy, and never curses her quite so heartily as he does the rest of the civilized world; and every little while he startles his stiff-necked adherents with moderate and benignant expressions which show the artificial nature of the Vatican thunder. The profane, it is said, would oftener see this phase of him if accurate reporting were in favor with the Curia; and the very fact that his most recent utterance has been permitted to go out as it stands, is regarded as a stroke of policy on the part of the more prudent managers. The occasion of it was an address by Prince Windischgrätz on the 12th of April. The Pope in reply spoke in his usual fashion, though more in sorrow than in anger, of the evil times upon which the Church had fallen, and of the duty of proclaiming to those in high places the divine retribution which was sure to overtake her oppressors. Then, by way of example, as he said, he addressed himself directly to the King of Italy, reminding him that there had been saints in his royal family, and exhorting him "with a father's affection" to consult his own interest by refusing to validate any further legislation injurious to the Church. He called the King's attention to certain features in the new penal code and in the military levy affecting priests, which tended to the Church's destruction, and concluded by begging him not to get deeper into debt with the Almighty. In the same deprecatory and imploring strain, he besought other rulers to pause in their downward course, and regretted that he had not, although the Vicar of Christ, the persuasiveness of Tertullian and other early apologists of the Catholic religion, who had practically solved the question of civil allegiance while maintaining their faith before pagan and idolatrous sovereigns, and diminishing persecution. If Christian princes would not likewise listen to him, he could only remind them of the plagues of Egypt. Such was the substance of a discourse which inveterate Ultramontanes are so far from thinking inspired that they have begun to ask themselves whether paternal feelings toward one's jailer do not furnish an argument for a non-Italian Pope as successor to Pius IX. It is, in fact, a curious paradox that to a nation as far off as Germany the Pope appears the most formidable of enemies, while at home he is wholly unfearful and mostly disregarded; and, on the other hand, that in his eyes the Emperor of Germany is one of the beasts of the Apocalypse, while the sovereign who keeps him in what he is pleased to call captivity seems not past saving, and decidedly worth a kind word or two now and then.

## THE CONTRACT SYSTEM IN PUBLIC WORKS.

TWO American gentlemen recently in London had their attention drawn to the new sewers of that city. The one, well versed in mechanical matters, was charmed with the masonry and construction, which he thought superior to anything he had ever seen of the kind. The other, who had been combating for some years what are popularly known as "jobs" and "rings," was still more charmed by finding that the construction had cost a trifle less than would have been paid for such work by private persons. During the last year, any one who has chanced to visit Washington has probably noticed in front of the Arlington Hotel a superb piece of asphalt pavement, apparently new, and at either end of it on the adjoining streets some more asphalt pavement, not superb and apparently old. If he made enquiries as to these, he was doubtless surprised on learning that that which appeared to be new is comparatively old, having been laid in the spring of 1870, while the other, which has been repaired and patched, is really new, having been down only about half the time. If the traveller prosecuted his enquiries further, he may have been astonished at learning that the worn-out pavement was petitioned for by the adjoining property-holders on account of the excellence of the former, and that the contractors who laid down the latter agreed that the worthless article should be in all respects as good as the other. But it will be a sufficient explanation for every rational American to be told that the good pavement was laid down by Mr. Corcoran, Governor Morgan, and a few other gentlemen, owning contiguous property, at their own cost and through their own contractors, and that the bad pavement was laid down by the public authorities in Washington at the public's expense, through the "Ring's" contractors.

It is this element of fraud in our public works which is creating considerable alarm and causing unknown loss. There is one class of public works where the fraud can be measured by the price, and where the loss consists almost entirely in paying more for the thing than it is worth—that is, paying more for it than an individual would pay if he had dealt with the contractor. Public buildings are generally of this character. The lumber may be badly seasoned, the brick of inferior quality, the glass defective, the ornamental work unsightly—everything charged for as first-rate may be in fact second-rate, and yet the edifice will keep the rain out and house its official occupants. Good citizens will be mortified at its poor condition, and good taste will be offended at its tawdry or shabby appearance, and still it will stand without requiring any serious outlay until, in the progress of events, we pull it down to make way for a larger or more sightly structure. But with another class of public works the conditions are different. Roads and streets and canals we begin to destroy the moment we begin to use them. To travel upon a roadway is literally to hammer it to pieces, and its durability means nothing less than its power of resistance. The excellence of such work depends almost wholly upon the honesty of its construction. Appearances when the contractor turns it over as completed mean nothing. The Washington contractors turned out a piece of work ostensibly of the same material and looking precisely like the pattern, and yet as nearly worthless as a pavement constructed of such materials could be. The price paid for the article which they agreed to furnish may not have been exorbitant, but the article which they did furnish may be little more than valueless. Hence it may be laid down as a rule, which few persons will question, that in roads, streets, and canals the public had better be cheated in the cost than in the construction.

With regard to the streets of large towns, it seems as if some effective reform must soon be forced upon city communities. Considering the heavy cost to property-holders, the inconvenience and injury to business during periods of rebuilding and repairing, the detriment to travel while they are in bad order, and the immense power which our present system places in the hands of professional politicians, it may be a question worth considering whether we cannot arrive at a system which shall take the construction out of the hands of the local authorities and place it under the supervision of the men who

pay for it. In some towns, as Philadelphia, every man is allowed to do his own paving. But this is a want of system rather than a system, and the result is that the pavements are of the poorest, and that there is an unsightly patchwork of different kinds, one man laying cobble-stones in front of his house to the centre of the street, and his opposite neighbor putting down Belgian. Good roadways in town or country are essential to civilization, and the loss occasioned by bad ones is a loss which cannot readily be computed. It is indispensable to anything worthy of being termed a system that there be some directing intelligence to secure unity and a desirable result. The authorities of a town must determine the grade of the street, the width of the sidewalks and carriage-way, the depth of the gutters, and the general style and character of the pavement. It is also indispensable that there be some legal obligation imposed upon the property-holders. In small communities there may be enough of public spirit to secure the voluntary contribution of every one. But in large communities this cannot be reckoned upon, and the system which puts the work of construction into the hands of the property-holders must also carry with it the legal power of enforcing payment from each. The first step in such a system would be to divide a street into small sections, say of city blocks, and then to give the property-holders in each section the privilege, for it could not be obligatory, of selecting the contractor, fixing the price, and supervising the work, if a majority of them were so inclined. As it now is, the property-holders are responsible for the work—i.e., when it falls to pieces they must pay for a new pavement, though they have not the privilege of employing the builder nor of supervising the construction. But, under a system which would enable them to contract and to supervise as well as to pay, we might expect that every one would be a very effective supervising agent, and that every contract would be as faithfully carried out as though the contractor were dealing with A., B., and C. individually. If, for illustration, our authorities should determine that Fifth Avenue should now be repaved with an asphalt pavement, the owners between Thirty-fourth and Thirty-fifth Streets might readily meet and determine whether they would do it themselves or allow the city to do it for them. If they chose the former course, and appointed as chairman of their construction committee Mr. A. T. Stewart, would not a block of pavement speedily appear on Fifth Avenue better than New York has ever seen, and would not its prime cost compare favorably with the "poultice pavement," which crumbled and dissolved almost as rapidly as it could be built?

But the general evil remains to be dealt with, and it is that the contract system has grown up to be an immense system of skilful and complex fraud. The ability and ingenuity developed in it excite surprise, just as the chemical and mechanical resources of counterfeiters awaken astonishment. People ask each other by what perversity of things it is that such talents and industry are spent in a criminal pursuit, and they are beginning to ask the same question with regard to a public contractor. The "contract system" came into fashion in this country about the time that our civil-service was falling to pieces. It was a specific designed to do away with the evil termed paternal government, and to furnish a sure remedy for getting on economically with dishonest and incompetent public officers. Now, paternal government is really a government undertaking to do things which can be accomplished by individual enterprise, and it makes very little difference whether the work be done by this agency or by that—by public officers or through the intervention of contractors, so long as it is the Government which is planning and paying. Contractors are generally men "inside politics," and there are no politicians in office more zealous and effective in caucuses and elections than public contractors. The Board of Public Works in Washington carried out all of its ambitious designs through contractors, and the contractors brought in thousands of country field-hands, and managed the political as well as the mechanical details of the city. The contract system, which has been enjoined upon us by statutes and constitutions, was really an effort to escape from danger by the simple process of running away from it. It was



perceptible to every one that if the civil-service, State and national, was to be handed over to every incompetent man who chanced to be a successful politician, public works could not be carried on directly by the Government. Erroneously it was thought that we could order our public officers to make bargains, and circumscribe them with impassable bounds; that we could secure cheapness by inviting competition; that our officials would have nothing to do with contractors, and our contractors nothing to do with politics; and generally, that we could have a paternal government in grand results, and a limited government in simplicity and integrity.

The "contract system," like everything else, has its proper uses, and, like everything else, when carried out of its limited sphere becomes a worthless or mischievous agency. How men ever could have supposed that the public officer who was not honest enough to carry on a public work, would be honest enough to enforce the rigid performance of a public contract, we do not undertake to explain. Neither can we tell for what reason it was hoped that the ignorant and incapable place-holder would suddenly become sagacious and circumspect enough to perform that most delicate task of making a discreet and effective contract. Every man who has ever built a house by contract knows how difficult it is to embrace everything and guard against everything, and how much really depends upon the honesty and business character of his contractor. Furthermore, the contract system, carried beyond its proper bounds, makes dishonesty easy; for it reduces stealing from a crime to a fraud. It lessens at the same time the chances of detection; for there is nothing so difficult to establish legally as fraudulent collusion. Half of the officials who have colluded with contractors in defrauding the State out of thousands would have shrunk from embezzling hundreds. The system as we have abused it is really one of the many nostrums of the world for making something out of nothing—for accomplishing a magnificent result without giving the inevitable consideration of honest, hard work. It has caused us ruinous outlays of money beyond any other system that was ever devised; it has produced, at its best, miserable results, and it has extended and intensified the interference of Government with the political concerns of the people to an almost despotic degree. After thirty years of trial it brings us around the circle to the starting-point, which may be briefly defined in these three conclusions: 1st, That whenever a government sees fit to carry its labors into the field of individual enterprise, it must expect to lose in money and to lose in morals, and it must understand that no instrumentality can ever be devised which will shield it from these losses. 2d, That everything in the way of public works which can be remitted to the vigilant supervision of individual citizens, disinterested, or interested only in its thorough performance, is just so much evil subtracted from the Government, and is tolerably certain of being well and cheaply done. 3d, That, as to those public works which must necessarily be done by the Government, an intelligent and respectable civil service is just as conditional to success as honest and capable agents are conditional to success in any ordinary undertaking; and that such a service can be secured only by the unwearied efforts of those who prefer the general welfare to the triumph of a political party, and are resolved to exact a decent administration of governmental affairs from whatever party chances to be in power.

#### DR. KENEALY'S SUPPORTERS.

THERE is something about the Kenealy, or rather Orton, agitation in England which to lookers-on at a distance is extremely ludicrous. It has, however, for the English themselves a very serious aspect, inasmuch as they see, or think they see, in the return of Orton's advocate, *as such*, to the House of Commons an ominous sign both of the ignorance and light-mindedness of the class of voters which has been created by the late Reform Act. Whether, however, Kenealy is or is not a fair specimen of the kind of man the new constituencies are likely to take up, or whether his cause is or is not a fair specimen of the kind of causes which is likely to enlist their sympathies, is a question on which it is hardly yet possible to

speculate with any profit. There is a not unnatural readiness among the opponents of the late extension of the franchise to draw conclusions unfavorable to its working, but it must be borne in mind that very little is as yet known about its working. It is only in two or three cases that the new voters have really shown any desire to emancipate themselves from the old political traditions, and it is fair, even under the most favorable circumstances, to expect a certain amount of folly and absurdity from the mere novelty of their situation. As yet, they have no policy, are hardly conscious of their power, and have furnished no means of judging what their steady bent will be. The election of Kenealy and of the author of 'Ginx's Baby' are probably the mere capering of a herd of colts which have been suddenly released from long confinement.

The question which interests foreigners is how any large body of men, with enough social training to earn their bread in a country on the whole as civilized as England, can possibly take up with fervor, or even a show of fervor, the cause of an impostor so thoroughly exposed as Orton has been. For it must not be forgotten that the question of his guilt has not been in the least affected by the hearing of the judges at the trial. The Lord Chief-Justice may have been unfair to him and his counsel, but there is and can be no pretence that the rulings materially affected the evidence in two of the longest judicial investigations on record, and before two different juries. Orton's claims were examined by a process too minute and protracted, and with too much publicity, to make the behavior of the judges of any real consequence as regards the final result. Nevertheless, there is undoubtedly a large body of the English people who do believe that the Claimant is Roger Tichborne. There is another large body whose state of mind was well illustrated by a picture in *Punch* the other day, in which one slightly intoxicated citizen, rapping his cane on the ground, says vehemently to another, who cordially concurs, "I don't care whether his name is Tichborne or Orton or Castro—what I say is, that I don't like to see a poor fellow kept out of his property."

The explanation of the muddle is, as it seems to us, simple enough. It does not arise, as many people seem to suppose, out of any new or deep-seated hostility of the populace to the aristocracy; indeed, the nature of the Claimant's pretensions makes this theory almost absurd. Earnest republicans are not ready to rise in revolution over a dispute between pretenders to a throne, and ardent democrats are apt to find better materials for an agitation than the claims of a butcher to a baronetcy. The more intelligent of Orton's supporters are persuaded of his genuineness simply because the proofs he offered in support of his claims were such as they were capable of appreciating, while those which were offered against him were such as they were not capable of appreciating. His triumphs, it will be remembered, were all achieved at the moment of his first appearance, and they were of a kind that was likely to strike the popular imagination. He was, in the first place, "recognized" by Lady Tichborne as her long-lost son, and with the aid of this incident, and of the cramming he had received about Sir Roger's history, he was able to carry by a sort of *coup de main* the recognition of some officers and men of Sir Roger's old regiment and of a few other persons. These things constituted to ninety-nine ignorant men and women out of a hundred a palpable, glaring demonstration of his good faith, and the popular disposition to believe was stimulated by what appeared to be the romantic, but by no means improbable, nature of his career. The young nobleman who goes off in quest of adventures, and conceals his rank in order to enjoy them in greater perfection, and marries the low-born girl of his heart, and then turns up to claim his patrimonial acres at the right time, is not only an attractive character, but one with which the frequenters of cheap theatres and the readers of popular fiction in England are very familiar. Thus far, therefore, Orton had everything in his favor, and secured a place in the popular heart from which it would have been difficult for *any* kind of proof to oust him.

But the kind of proof which was brought against him on subsequent investigation consisted, in the main, in the application of

tests the force of which was only visible to educated men and women, or, in other words, to the upper classes of English society. It was shown that he did not know things which a person in Sir Roger Tichborne's position would be sure to know, and that he had forgotten things which such a person would be sure to remember; but the cogency of this kind of proof was not perceptible to English peasants or mechanics, owing to their ignorance of the manners and customs of the Tichborne circle. Orton's educational defects, too, fatal as they were to his pretensions in the eyes of professional and university men and members of Parliament, were mere trifles to the persons who voted for Dr. Kenealy. That he should have been educated at Stonyhurst and have not only forgotten all about the "Quadrangle," but not have known what a quadrangle was, was incredible to an Etonian or Harrow boy, or, in fact, to any boy who had "school days" to look back on; but to a man who had worked in a mill or colliery from the age of six, and who did not himself know what "a quadrangle" was, it was the most natural thing or the most trifling thing possible. In like manner, his peculiar translation of the Latin motto, "*Laus Deo semper*," was nothing surprising to a man who had never learnt Latin; and his total loss of French, after having used it for twenty-five years as his mother-tongue, was a very conceivable misfortune to a British mechanic or small tradesman, who thought French awfully hard to learn, and therefore very easy to forget. We might, in the same way and with the same result, run over a large part of the evidence which ruined the Claimant's hopes in the eyes of the educated British public. It would be found to be of a kind which the constitution of English society and the depth of English popular ignorance deprived of all weight in the eyes of "the masses."

With the small-shopkeeper class, in which the Claimant has many supporters, another influence, in the shape not only of a profound hatred of "Popery," but profound belief in the capacity and unscrupulousness of the Jesuits, has also told in his favor. The upper classes in England have of late years, and not without some show of reason, incurred great suspicions among the lower middle-class of a leaning to Catholicism; and the fact that Orton was a jolly fellow, who had emancipated himself from ecclesiastical influences in the Australian bush, and that the estates were held by a fatherless infant minor whose mother was presumably surrounded by priests, was enough of itself, in the eyes of a great many of that half-taught and narrow-minded class which in every country most faithfully preserves the national traditions, to make his cause the cause of all true-born Englishmen, and his defence a protest against the introduction of "Popery, brass money, and wooden shoes." The power of this old and, in its origin, not ignoble prejudice is well but comically displayed in one member of Parliament, the pious Whalley, who has supported the Claimant faithfully from the beginning, and firmly believes that the trial was directed by the Roman Propaganda. The working of English public opinion about the affair, in fact, furnishes a social study of greater interest than Orton's own career.

#### ENGLAND.—TORY MISMANAGEMENT.

LONDON, April 24, 1875.

MR. DISRAELI is trying the patience both of the House of Commons and of the country at large by his eccentric conduct of public business. He has thought fit to take up the rôle of Lord Palmerston, but, up to the present time, with only partial success—his sardonic appearance, his enigmatic turn for mysterious surprises, and his unaffected satire being incongruous elements in a make-up of one whom England delighted to reverence as "jolly old Pam." I never see him in one of his Palmerstonian poses without being reminded of a current anecdote of the times. A new religious sect has sprung up in this country—I dare say you may have branches in America—called Devotionalists. Their tenets, so far as I can comprehend them, seem to combine the extremes of Spiritualism with the extremes of Evangelicism. At one of their recent functions it is narrated how a lady was troubled by a large portrait of Lord Palmerston in the room, which always followed her with its eyes, and, as she imagined,

winked at her during the most thrilling moments of the ceremonial. Mr. Disraeli must be grateful that he is not confronted with a similar phenomenon in the House of Commons. If anything could perturb his composure it would be the continual presence of such a dumb witness of his eccentricities, winking in silent criticism at his strange manoeuvres. But, in the absence of any such troublesome agency, Mr. Disraeli goes down night after night to the House of Commons, whose serious deliberations he is supposed to conduct, and, having assumed the comic mask of his predecessor of ten years ago, with a mocking air which sat so cheerily on Lord Palmerston but so differently upon him, confounds both friends and foes by the audacity of his sallies and the jauntiness of his jests.

This did well enough just at first. Members who had heard with unfeigned anxiety alarming rumors as to the Prime Minister's health, welcomed his quizzing way as a practical contradiction to the rumors. But they begin to think that they have had too much of this sort of drollery, and even to cast back some longing looks towards the days of the Gladstonian dispensation, when it was all work and no play, and when earnestness unrelieved by the faintest glimmer of merriment was the order of the day. Just consider the proceedings in the lower House since the reassembling of Parliament after the Easter recess, three weeks ago. How have the best hours of almost every day—the hours, namely, between half-past four and dinner-time—been occupied? While grave questions, involving possibly the peace of Europe, have been discussed in most of the legislative assemblies on the Continent of Europe, what have been the subjects of the deliberations of the British House of Commons? The Government have been spending hours wrangling with Dr. Kenealy about the reception of a petition from an unknown village, prepared and manipulated as such things can be by an illiterate publican in the interests of the convict Orton. The thing should never have been noticed, and no human being would have heard of its existence. Mr. Disraeli, however, thought otherwise. He made up his mind to regard it as a matter affecting the stability of the constitution, and invested it with a factitious importance which its own merits could never have secured. During these same three weeks the supporters of the Government, and notably a country member called Sir Lawrence Palk, have been openly endeavoring to burke an enquiry, set on foot by one or two members of the late administration, into some of the glaring corruptions of the City; and the Government, led on by the First Minister of the Crown, instead of resisting these endeavors, have thrown the weight of their majority and their influence into the same scale with them, and have encouraged their supporters to sacrifice hours of valuable time in unseemly squabbles about the privileges of the House. Personalities, trivialities, questions of privilege, wrangles with Kenealy—these are the matters that have engrossed the attention of Government and the House of Commons, while the diplomatic relations of the Great Powers have been hanging in the balance. And when Mr. Disraeli was questioned, during one of the more lucid intervals, on these relations, shortly after the reassembling of Parliament, he thought it consistent with his own dignity and with the dignity of a great country to snub the questioner, and to shelter himself from an awkward interrogatory behind the laughter of his followers who sat around him, and are ever ready to play the *claque* to all his sallies.

In the early days of the session this sort of polished buffoonery did well enough. Members of Parliament felt that they had several months before them to get through the legislation of the year. But here we are close upon the Whitsuntide recess with next to nothing done, and no abatement to the Christmas pantomime which has usurped the place of the sober work of the session. Members are getting weary of a constant pantaloonaade. "The work of the House of Commons," as one of them said to me the other day, "under this Administration, reminds me of nothing but a bad breakfast at an inferior French restaurant. You know the sort of thing—radishes, olives, prawns, crayfish, and the like, to whet the appetite—'fiddlings,' I call them—and then the substantial food at the end, when you have had so much of the 'fiddlings' that you cannot touch it." It is all "fiddlings" in the House of Commons nowadays, and when the substantial food comes on no one remains to take part in it. In the old time, when Mr. Gladstone was Chancellor of Exchequer—nay, even when Mr. Lowe was Chancellor of Exchequer—the House used to be crowded to the doors on the budget night; the lobbies were full of politicians and mercantile men, thankful for the faintest echoes which came out to them; and places in the galleries were bespoken for days, and occupied at the earliest moment. Last Thursday week the budget was introduced. But before it came on, a motion was made by the Prime Minister on a question of privilege, and the petition for the release of Orton was debated with all the solemnity of a vote of confidence previous to a ministerial crisis. The House was crowded



enough during these discussions; but when Sir Stafford Northcote rose to unfold his budget, the House and galleries were cleared, the lobbies left untenanted, and he spoke for two hours, elaborating a great scheme for the payment of the national debt, to a sleepy gathering of about fifty members. The "fiddlings" had been too much for the representatives of the people, whose main duties, theoretically at least, are fiscal; and, exhausted by the personalities elicited by the discussion on the question of privilege and the release of a convict, they left the taxation of the country and the national debt to take care of themselves.

But it is not only in the conduct of the formal business in the House that the tendency to frivolity and trifling is so manifest. In the graver matters of legislation the determination to play at law-making rather than to work at it prevails. The Queen's speech, as you will remember, was full of promises of beneficial reform, and many, I myself among the number, were deluded into the belief that it would be a useful session, and that the administration, with its "despotic and insolent majority" (to borrow the epithets addressed to it on Thursday by The O'Gorman), intended to leave its mark on history as an administration which had put to rights many domestic grievances of a real and tangible kind. These hopes have been blighted for this session. The severe winter which has made such havoc with all green things has not spared the ministerial blossoms. It has nipped them all, and the prospect of fruit is nil. The measures, as Lord Granville put it the other day in the House of Lords, have, one and all, been like the painted balloons which children play with in the street—very pretty to look at but without anything inside them. A measure was introduced to clear away the city "rookeries," and give good cottages to the artisan classes. But the bill contains no adequate machinery to set the authorities in motion to carry out these clearances, no provision for the rooks when cleared, and no certainty that the new cottages will ever be built. Another measure proposes to take in hand the accounts of friendly societies, and prevent the poor from being robbed by the officials connected with those societies. But the officials are to audit their own accounts—"The cat is to watch the cream," to quote Mr. Lowe's criticism—or leave them unaudited if they prefer to do so, and the poor are to go on being robbed as heretofore, the only difference being that the robbery is henceforth to be carried on under sanction of an Act of Parliament. Dazzling promises are dangled in another bill before the eyes of the tenant-farmers of England and Scotland. They are offered compensation for improvements made by them in their farms, longer tenancy than formerly, and a better tenure of their holdings. These simple acts of justice sound satisfactory; but by a sweeping provision at the end of the bill any landlord may, by an ordinary writing under his hand, withdraw himself and his farms from the operation of the act, and so leave his tenants in the lurch; and it was announced in the House of Lords that the great majority of landlords had already made arrangements to take advantage of this provision if by any chance the bill became law. We were promised a bill to put a stop to the pollution of rivers, which would secure pure drinking water for the lieges and unpoisoned streams for the fishes. But the manufacturing interest would have been alienated from the Government if such a measure had been pressed, and so we have heard, and shall hear, no more of it. The courts of justice, again, in the United Kingdom were to be put in harmony with the times, and the obsolete jurisdiction of the House of Lords as a court of appeal was to have been abolished, and a bill was introduced for the purpose both last session and this, the measure being really the coping-stone upon the legislation of the previous Government. But a caucus of Tory peers and lawyers met in some obscure house in an obscure street near Lord Salisbury's residence upon a Saturday, and on the following Monday the Lord Chancellor announced that the bill was likely to meet with opposition, and therefore the Government had no alternative but to withdraw it.

I need not weary you with further instances to prove that, both in the formal conduct of affairs and in the grave matters of legislation, Mr. Disraeli and his Government are not maintaining their position in the estimate which was formed of them. The superstition prevalent in England, and, like many more deeply-rooted superstitions, sedulously fostered by the Tory party and the Tory press, that Mr. Disraeli, in the rôle of Lord Palmerston, is a heaven-born leader of the House of Commons, is fast dying out. People are awakening to serious doubts of his infallibility. It does not require a Political Expostulation to proclaim it to the world. He makes small mistakes almost every night, and large ones almost every week. But he has the knack of recovering himself by a happy hit from time to time, and these recoveries prolong the death-bed of the superstition of his infallibility. On Thursday last, by snubbing Mr. Sullivan when he asked a modest question as to the proposals of Government upon the anomalous relations of the House of Commons and the press, he committed

a grave error. Mr. Sullivan is an Irishman, but he is also the proprietor of a newspaper, and there are several other proprietors of newspapers in the House, some of them not uninfluential. By snubbing Mr. Sullivan, when a civil answer would have satisfied him, Mr. Disraeli offended all these men, and, unless Lord Hartington had come to the rescue yesterday, and offered to bring the matter formally before the House, reporters would have been excluded for the rest of the session, and, putting the matter on the lowest grounds, the public would have been deprived of their morning reading.

Mistakes like these soon begin to tell against an administration. From the recent by-elections, it has been made manifest that the feeling in the country is turning back, slowly perhaps, but surely, to its natural current in favor of a Liberal rather than a Tory management of affairs. In the House itself, the division of last Wednesday on the second reading of the bill to permit Dissenters to be buried according to their own rites within the precincts of the parish church-yards is looked upon by many as full of happy augury for the party in opposition. It will seem strange to you in America that Englishmen should, in this the latter part of the nineteenth century, still persist in excluding the bodies of those who have not been baptized according to an Episcopal ceremonial, from burial in the church-yard of the parish according to the observances of the Dissenting sect to which they belong. But such is indeed the case, and it seems impossible to make it otherwise. For some years past, efforts have been made to provide a remedy by law. But the church is too strong. In former sessions the bill has been always thrown out by considerable majorities. On Thursday, in one of the largest houses of the session, it was again thrown out, but only by a majority of 14—238 voting in the minority against the Government. The question was no doubt a good one to bring together the forces of the Opposition. But the number of defections from the Tory to the Liberal side, and the number of Tory absentees, in the face of strong Government pressure, indicate that some of the Ministerial team are not sorry to take an opportunity of kicking over the traces, even at some risk, if not of overturning, at least of shaking, the Ministerial coach.

#### BELGIUM AND GERMANY.

PARIS, April 23.

NEUTRAL countries are the dangerous places in our old Europe, where the Great Powers make their trials of strength before the great struggles of war. The Crimean war did not break forth suddenly: it began in the Holy Places, which constitute a sort of neutral ground, divided between the various Christian communions. Every time the name of Belgium is pronounced, Europe naturally becomes uneasy. Belgium ought to be always, like good children, seen but not heard. It is not to be wondered at if the recent exchange of diplomatic notes between Prussia and the Cabinet of Brussels has produced much uneasiness in Europe. The text of these notes is now before the world, and there is not much to be said about it from a technical point of view. Germany complains of some attacks made against her sovereign, not only in the Belgian press, but by persons who are under the control of the Belgian Government, these persons being no less than the Catholic bishops of Belgium. The German note at once touched the difficult question of the relations of church and state, and gave a weapon to the Opposition, as the Catholic party is now in power at Brussels.

The question was brought only two days ago before the Parliament at Brussels in a very practical form. Monsignor Deschamps, of Malines, is among the bishops who were promoted some time ago to the rank of cardinal at the same time as Archbishop Manning. There is an old decree of Messidor, in virtue of which some military honors are due to the cardinals in Belgium, and the Catholic ministry, headed by M. Malon, ordered these honors to be rendered to Cardinal Deschamps on his return to Malines. The Opposition objected to this, by the mouth of the late Minister of Justice in the Liberal cabinet. How can you tell the Cabinet of Berlin, he enquired, that the Belgian bishops are not public functionaries, if you recognize them as such yourselves? and how can you say that you are not responsible for their sayings and doings? In virtue of the Belgian constitution, which is posterior to the decree of Messidor, church and state are kept quite separate in Belgium. The Cabinet made a very feeble answer; but a member of the Catholic party, who bears a name dear to all patriotic hearts in Belgium, reproached the Liberal Opposition with being in alliance with the "triumphant force which rules in Berlin."

The waters, as you see, are much troubled in Belgium. So they are in Italy. I was speaking a few days ago with an Italian gentleman of great distinction, who said to me: "We intend to remain faithful to the noble motto of Cavour, 'Libera chiesa in libero stato.' During the last war

between Prussia and France we entered Rome without the help of any foreign power, and we voted in our Parliament the law which is called 'the law of guarantees,' which allows a complete spiritual independence to the Church of Rome. After this law was passed there was a Cabinet council, in which it was discussed whether we should or not make a diplomatic communication of this law to foreign powers. After much discussion, it was decided that we should not: we considered the question of our relations with the Pope and the Church of Rome as a purely internal question, and we did not wish to give any power the right to express an opinion on the solution which we had freely found for this question." I asked my interlocutor if the Italian Government intended to remain on that ground, and he told me that he thought it would. Italy wishes to keep for herself all the advantages of possessing in its new capital the spiritual head of the Catholic Church, but in virtue of the law of guarantees she will not bear the responsibility of the action of the Pope. This position is a very difficult one to maintain. Deprive the Pope of all his provinces, as long as you leave a square foot on which he can stand, and stand independently, he will be in a spiritual sense as independent as ever. The actual Pope has not, in my opinion, overstepped the limits of the power which the confidence of the Catholic Church has placed in him. He spoke a short time ago with much moderation of the sovereign who has deprived him of his provinces; he reminded Victor Emanuel that there had been saints in his family, and seemed to offer him the olive-branch of pardon. Strange as it may appear to many, there are bonds of secret sympathy between him and the head of the House of Savoy.

But suppose for a moment that a Pope comes forward animated by the spirit of old times, who speaks to the new German Emperor in the style of the Middle Ages, and uses such words as are used in all bulls—"Race of vipers, serpents, etc.," what will the German Emperor do? He will ask the King of Italy to shut the mouth of the spiritual sovereign who would excommunicate him and sunder the bonds of fidelity between him and his Catholic subjects. And if the Italian King says that he cannot do so, the German Emperor will, like some of his predecessors, ask leave to do it himself; he will claim the right to go himself to the Vatican and to punish the offender. Renan, who is so much hated by the Catholics since his 'Life of Jesus,' remarked to me yesterday: "The Germans have never understood the force of the spiritual power; their ideal is not the Catholic ideal, superior to all questions of race, of color, of nationality. Bismarck speaks of the Pope as a man who only believes in the force of strong battalions. He comes forward, not as an infidel, an unbeliever, an exegetist; he would be sorry to see the Germans become a nation of philosophers. What does he really want? It is to make of his master a new Pope, an evangelical Pope. He would not like to suppress the Catholic Church in Germany. He would be satisfied if Catholicism was reduced to ceremonies and to the preaching of the famous formula: Give unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's. He hoped that under the excitement created by the war he could reduce the Catholic clergy of Germany to mere tools of the German Emperor; he has found that there is a passion even stronger than patriotism, more irreducible, more impenetrable; and in his wrath he is taking measures which go directly against his object. The Catholic churches, which were much neglected, are now full in Germany; all the forces which are hostile to him have taken the Catholic flag. A real crusade has begun, and who knows who will be the conqueror?"

I repeat to you what I hear, confessing that I feel much perplexed at the present aspect of things. I could not have imagined a few years ago that the *rabies theologica* could have seized the men of my generation as it has done lately. The character of Prince Bismarck seems to be a riddle. It becomes more and more clear to me that he does not belong to the ordinary class of statesmen; what he has done is something almost stupendous, but it seems as if all he has done were only a stepping-stone for something else. He is aiming at nothing else than the destruction of an immense church, which counts millions of adherents in all parts of the world; and he has so entangled the spiritual question with the ordinary rivalries of nations and races, that the world may feel itself on the eve of a hundred-years war. I have been told that the intolerance and impetuosity of his character are such that he cannot look with patience on a Catholic priest or ceremony. He would not say, like your serene Emerson,

"I love a priest, I love a prophet of the soul."

No; he is the representative of a high-and-dry state, surrounded with an army, a police, and with functionaries and professors who have become the functionaries of the mind. And a great country is adopting this ideal; the National Liberal party can no longer see anything except through this prosaic ideal. Fifteen hundred thousand men stand ready to fight for it at

any moment; and the law of nations, which hitherto has only been intended to stop the movements of armies and of fleets, will now be remodelled so as to become the instrument of it.

I said a few days ago to a diplomat: "How is it that you have always claimed for neutrals the right to deal in all the materials of war: to sell powder, charcoal, arms, cloth—all that goes to constitute an army and a fleet? You have only objected to the actual instrument of war, all ready for action, which could leave the neutral territory or the neutral waters and take part in the struggle. You have not thought it possible in the present state of the world to do more than this; and now you are discussing quietly the means of stopping the expression of hostile thoughts. Louis XIV. made war on Holland, but he could never hinder the Dutch presses from publishing the innumerable pamphlets directed against him. Has the world become so small since the invention of telegrams and railways that there should be a sort of international police, and that the strongest power can make itself feared and obeyed throughout the world?"

My personal feelings may blind me in this case. I have often been offended abroad by the coarse and brutal expression of hostility to my country. Only this summer, I remember buying before the Cathedral of Milan a pamphlet in which MacMahon was attacked with the most cruel animosity. I read in it that he had never been wounded at Sedan; that he made believe that he had been, in order to avoid the responsibility of the capitulation. I have read in England the most outrageous libels against all the potentates of the world. I have never opened the *Times* without reading some article which might have become the subject of a diplomatic correspondence if governments could be made responsible for the press. And I ask myself in all sincerity: what the meanest reporter can do, what an anonymous journalist does every day of his life, shall I refuse this to a man merely because he is a priest, because he has a faith and defends it, for the reason that he receives a pittance from the state? Under Napoleon III., some bishops in France delivered charges on the Roman question; and he allowed himself to be compared to Diocletian, and to the worst Roman emperor, by men who were actually salaried by his government. He was right; generosity can hardly be excessive when it is applied to men who, though they may fight for a bad cause, do it for honorable and noble motives. But I dare say I am behind the times; we have entered an age of iron and blood, and generosity is not the order of the day. *Vae victis* has become the motto of our age. The religion of force is dominant; it has so many devotees that it may perhaps be more indulgent towards the religions which can only wield spiritual weapons.

How strange our struggles must appear to you across the Atlantic, and how jealous we might feel of a country like yours where truth believes in its own intrinsic value, and is not dependent on the powers of the state. Our Old World, with its five millions of men in arms, its kings and its republicans, its decayed aristocrats and its corrupt democracies, has become an object of pity and of terror. It is always ready for new convulsions, and it can find no rest. Old statesmen who have fought a lifetime for religious liberty are now attacking it, consciously or unconsciously; sovereigns have become the propagators of revolution; and revolutionists have made themselves the instruments of a new tyranny. "Alas!" said one of my friends a few days ago, "I have spent my life in being more conservative than our millionaires, more royalist than our royal princes, and more French than France!" Victor Hugo has called the year of the war "the terrible year"; every year has now become so to a patriotic Frenchman. We see the storm gathering round us on all sides; we are obliged, in order to save ourselves, to tie our fate to things condemned by destiny.

#### CONSTITUTION-MENDING IN PRUSSIA.

BERLIN, April 26, 1875.

**K**LADDERADATSCHE has a picture representing two men, one snuffing the air and saying: "There is a smell of something burning, like powder"; the other answering with an ironical smile: "Only newspaper" (*Zeitungspapier*). From a certain point of view there is no objection to seeing the war-alarm treated in such a manner even by that part of the press whose vocation it is not to crack jokes and manufacture puns. For a long time business of every kind has been, all over Germany, in such a condition that any alarm is to be seriously deprecated. It is therefore a matter of congratulation that, thanks to the exertions of the press, the uneasiness created by the letter written to the Cologne *Gazette* "from Vienna," and more particularly by the famous article of the *Post*, has almost entirely disappeared. Yet it is even more certain now than at first that the latter had its origin in the office of the Chancellor, and that it was meant to be a warning hint to the supposed eventual "Catholic League" of France, Aus-



tria, and Italy. The journey of the Crown Prince is, contrary to the first intention, made "in the strictest incognito," and those who are not without experience in such things point to this as a further proof of a significant reserve in the attitude of our Government towards Italy. The letter of the Emperor to the King, and the rumor, busily circulated by the press, that the former is still thinking of going some time to Italy, these political augurs are inclined to take merely as signs that the German Government has not yet renounced the hope of renewing the friendship in all its former cordiality and sincerity. The same view is pretty generally taken with regard to our relations with Austria. Yet there is a feeling that the air is filled with mists which, at not too distant a day, may form into clouds. The main reason of this belief is the conviction that in Austria, as well as in Italy, there are powers at work which render it quite possible that, under certain circumstances, their policy will not be decided by their obvious interests and according to the wishes of the majority of the people when in a sober mood, but by the rancor and the ambition of a faction or a momentary impulse of the passions of the day. One of the principal questions is, how much skill the Vatican and France will show in playing on these strings.

On the other hand, one also very frequently meets with the opinion that Bismarck overshot the mark in the article of the *Post*, allowing himself to be carried away by his nervousness and irascibility. In the same circles—and they are decidedly friendly to the Empire and to the Chancellor—the course pursued by him towards Belgium has caused much regret, and is ascribed to the same reasons. They refuse to discuss at all the merits of the principles involved, simply saying that it is unworthy of a great power to make a fuss about such things; Bismarck should consider Germany so strong that she can afford not to notice the kicking of the Belgian Ultramontanes. My impression is that the public are really gratified to learn that this comedy of "much ado about nothing" has come to an end, and one often hears the wish expressed that the Prince were less apt to lose his temper.

With regard to the question which becomes every day more and more the all-absorbing one, this reproach does not apply, though it would perhaps sometimes be better if Bismarck were somewhat more guarded in his language. It was my good fortune to be present at the delivery of his two great speeches in the House of Representatives, on the motion of the Government to strike out Articles 13, 16, and 18 of the Constitution. A picture of more absolute calmness and at the same time utter firmness and resolution, could not be imagined. To have heard and seen him on this occasion, and to harbor any doubt that he feels as if he already had the final victory surely and safely in his pocket, is impossible. The majority of the House showed the same temper, the most violent thrusts of the Ultramontanes exciting only a good-natured hilarity. But though one entirely approves of the motion and of the temper in which it is being carried through in both Houses of the Landtag, one cannot help feeling a deep concern in looking beyond the immediate future to a more distant day. The most important of the three articles in question is the first, which provides that the regulation and management of their internal affairs shall be left to the different churches; the second leaves free the intercourse between the clergy and their ecclesiastical superiors; and in the third the state renounces, with certain limitations, its rights of patronage. At first view, all the three articles appear to be dictated by a spirit which every liberal-minded man would and should be exceedingly loth to disavow; in fact, however, they have from the first never served any purpose but to promote the pernicious pretensions of Rome. The reason of this is very plain, and it is stated with great precision in the "motives." Article 15, of which Articles 16 and 18 are but applications, is, to borrow an Americanism, a "glittering generality," and therefore any consequences one pleases may be tortured out of it. This is what the Ultramontanes have been doing from the first, and what they would go on doing to the end if the article were allowed to stand. At first they affected to believe the expression "church" to mean not the concrete religious association and corporation, but the mysterious abstraction which, in their creed, is called "the church." Now, as this "church" is as high above the state and the whole world as the sky is above the earth, it was of course not for the state to decide what are and what are not internal affairs of the church. In this respect the state had to receive the law from the church, and, since the Ecumenical Council, the law of the church is the *dictum* of the Pope. Bismarck spoke the sober truth when he said: "By our constitution—i. e., since we are constitutional—there is in Prussia hardly anybody personally and autocratically so powerful as this high Italian prelate, surrounded by his council of Italian priests." And "the firm point" on which the levers for the erection of this *imperium in imperio* have been fixed is the "glittering generality" of Article 15 of the

constitution. The striking out of Article 15 does not mean that henceforth the internal affairs of the churches shall not be regulated by themselves; it only means that the relations between the state and the churches shall be determined by special laws, so that it can no longer, in any given case, be a debatable question what are the internal affairs of the churches which by the laws of the state are left to their own regulation. Bismarck called this "the way to peace," on which it will be possible "to change the aggressive warfare into which we have been forced for a while into a defensive one, leaving the aggression more to the enlightening influences of the schools." It is the way, and the only way, to real peace; for without certainty of the law there cannot be peace, and there is no possibility of the law being certain so long as it is left doubtful where the power of ultimate decision of the questions in dispute rests. This power, which the state had never intended to renounce, but which to a great extent had been actually wrested from it by means of these three articles of the constitution, is now reclaimed in such a manner that the possibility of a foul truce is precluded. The state is irrevocably binding itself to know but one way of ending the war—viz., the full acknowledgment of the supremacy of the laws of the state on the part of the Ultramontanes. This has nothing whatever to do, as the Ultramontanes are pleased to pretend, with the question of religious liberty. Article 12 of the constitution remains untouched, and that secures to everybody "the liberty of his religious creed" and the liberty "of associating in religious societies." It is not in this respect that exception can be taken to this last and, as I think, decisive stroke of the state. The weak point before alluded to, which in the course of time might easily grow into a serious danger, lies in quite a different direction.

Every liberal-minded American will applaud the Chancellor's declaration that, in a short time, he hopes to be so far along that "the aggression can be left to the enlightening influences of the schools." But the Chancellor, as well as the majority of the Landtag, has failed to propose doing the one thing without which it is impossible to attain this desirable end. Article 24 of the constitution lays it down as a principle that, as far as possible, the confessional character of the schools shall be maintained. Remember the untiring exertions of the Catholic clergy in the State of New York to get a part of the common schools into their hands, and the earnest warnings addressed by you to the people not to let this plot succeed, and you will readily agree with me that this Article 24 leaves to the Prussian Ultramontanes the very citadel of their power. This opinion was forcibly urged in the caucus of the National Liberals, but the proposition to introduce a motion in the Landtag that Article 24 should share the fate of Articles 15, 16, and 18 received only the vote of the mover, although the great majority of the party certainly do not controvert the correctness of the principle involved in the proposition. This action of the party seems to me to indicate a really alarming political shortsightedness, the consequences of which may be of a very grave character. It appears to me in the highest degree likely that, in a very short time, the Government will be forced to move, in response to the continued resistance and attacks of the Ultramontanes, the striking out of this article. The majority of the Landtag will then, as readily as they are now doing, adopt the proposition of the Government, but in doing so they will sap one of the most important principles of true constitutional liberty, which they would leave comparatively unhurt if they were to strike it out now, together with the three other articles. It is the worst feature of our constitution that the changing of it is as easy a thing as the passing of the most indifferent law, and that the people at large have no influence whatever upon it. A change of the constitution is effected by the concurrence of the King and the two Houses of the Landtag, only 21 days being required to elapse between the different stages the bill has to pass through. Dr. Falk, answering Mr. Richter of Sangerhausen, thought the concurrence of the "three factors of legislation" an amply sufficient security against hasty and pernicious changes of the fundamental law of the state. Would you, looking at the experience of the United States, admit the correctness of this assertion? It is a constitutionalism of a rather doubtful character not to permit the people at large to participate in the decision of the most important questions which possibly can be presented to any people, by at least holding a general election between the proposition and the adoption of a change in the fundamental law. But there being as yet no chance of getting thus much conceded, our representatives should at least do everything in their power to prevent the establishing of a loose practice with regard to the changing of the constitution. We are in a state of war, and the liberal parties are entirely agreed that a purification of the constitution is needed, but a clean sweep should be made of all the untenable and obnoxious provisions.

There is perhaps no greater danger for the consolidation and growth

of real constitutional government in Germany than for the people to get in the habit of regarding the constitution as an instrument, the single articles of which may be thrown overboard with a light heart whenever they are found to work badly. And there is danger lest the Government, the Landtag, and the people get deeply involved in this dangerous way just because we are in the midst of a war of enormous magnitude, the exigencies of which are apt to present further changes in an exceedingly plausible light. This danger is considerably increased by the great superiority of Bismarck over the other members of the Cabinet as well as over the members of the Landtag. It is true the conservative bent of his mind affords a certain guaranty; but on the other hand he is as revolutionary as he is conservative, and his temper makes him more inclined to short and sharp cuts than to the slower and more laborious but safer process of disentangling. His genius and his good luck may carry him safely through all difficulties to the last, as they have done heretofore; but he will have entailed on the people a bad inheritance if he accustom those who have neither his genius nor his good luck to consider this the best manner of dealing with political problems, the satisfactory solution of which can only be the fruit of the best and most strenuous exertions of generations. My ambition is not to play the ungrateful part of Cassandra; I have full confidence in our future, but we are far from being out of the woods.

## Correspondence.

### PACIFIC MAIL AND ITS SUBSIDY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In view of the evident purpose of the supporters of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company to use every effort to secure a renewal of the portion of the subsidy withdrawn by the recent act of Congress, will you kindly furnish us, through the columns of your valuable paper, some information as to the extent of the obligation of the people of the United States to that Company, which must of course be made the basis of an application to Congress? If the Company has, while doing a really good work, forced the country to pay an extravagant price for it, the weight of the obligation would certainly not seem oppressive. Aside from the gift of the subsidy, it seems to some of us that the people of the United States have contributed a sufficient amount to the treasury of the Company to enable it to return very respectable dividends, notwithstanding some severe losses.

It is often said that the Company is obliged to demand high rates for freight and passage on account of the light cargoes which the outward steamers carry through the scarcity of freight for China and Japan. If this is true, why is not some effort made to encourage shippers? There are now four sailing-vessels en route for Japan, and probably more than as many more for China; and there is no doubt but that a large part of the cargoes of these vessels might have been taken by the steamers of the Pacific Mail Company had they cared to reduce their rates; but, instead of so doing, freight by steam from New York to Japan has been as high as \$40 and \$50 gold per ton, against less than \$16 from London to Japan. After making all due allowance for the unsettled state of business on the comparatively new route, it certainly ought not to cost nearly three times as much to transport cargo from New York to Japan as from London. The necessary inference would seem to be that freight is not, and of late has not been, scarce.

As to homeward cargo, the problem seems to be how to find room for it on board the steamers. Though two steamers per month have sailed for San Francisco the past year, freight has accumulated at the Asiatic ports. Even now, in what is usually considered as the duldest season of the year, the *City of Peking*, large as she is, will leave over 500 tons of freight at the port of Yokohama alone.

Owing to the nearness of the American market and to other reasons, it has been possible to open a very promising trade in American drugs and hardware, notwithstanding the exorbitant rate of freight; but, since the recent combination of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company and the railroad companies, telegrams received indicate a very great increase in the tariff. One telegram puts the rate of freight apparently as high as \$80 per ton. What chance have our American merchants and manufacturers to compete with those of England and the Continent against such odds? Does not this rate mean the almost entire suspension of trade in American goods, excepting so far as it can be carried on by means of sailing-vessels? Before this combination, relief might have been looked for from English steamers; but, with the railroads against them, English capitalists will hesitate about entering upon so hazardous an enterprise.

Is it wise to strengthen the hands of a combination which threatens to inflict so serious a blow upon American commercial interests? In case an additional subsidy is granted, would it not be well to offset it by another to the merchants, tea-drinkers, etc.? The latter should in justice be five times as great as the former; and if it should be intended to cover constructive damages to the American trade, no one but a Fourth-of-July orator would venture to compute its proper size.

AN AMERICAN.

YOKOHAMA, April 9, 1875.

## Notes.

THE pirating of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' by a Philadelphia house has compelled resort to the same measure of protection adopted in the case of 'Chambers's Encyclopædia,' viz., the insertion in future volumes of copyrighted articles by American writers.—A club whose object is "the association of authors, artists, and men of science, and amateurs of music, letters, and the fine arts," has just been formed in Philadelphia. It is called the Penn Club, and is limited to two hundred members.—In the same city, the committee on public health of the Social Science Association has memorialized the General Assembly in behalf of a State Board of Health. A bill to create such a board was favorably reported to the Senate at the last session, but failed to become a law.—The Centennial Exhibition will, in addition to its line of agricultural implements and machinery, undertake a display of live stock (chiefly in September and October) and of fruits. Enquiries should be addressed to the Chief of Bureau of Agriculture, Philadelphia.—J. B. Lippincott & Co. have in press a new edition of 'The Romance of Natural History,' by Philip Henry Gosse; and 'The Abuse of Maternity, through its Rejection and through its Unwise Acceptance,' by an anonymous writer.—'A Standard Temperance Prize Essay' is in request by the National Temperance Society of this city. It is to be in three parts, and prizes are now about to be awarded to competitors for the first, viz.: "The Scientific; embracing the Chemical, Physiological, and Medical aspects." The other two parts are "The Historical, Statistical, Economical, and Political," and "The Social, Educational, and Religious." For the best essay under each of these two heads \$500 will be paid, and \$300 for the second-best. The offer remains open till July 1, 1876. Further information may be had of Mr. A. M. Powell, 58 Reade Street.—B. Westermann & Co., 524 Broadway, announce that they are the American agents for a new English periodical, *Hallberg's Illustrated Magazine*, to be issued shortly in Stuttgart by the publishers of the popular illustrated German weekly, *Ueber Land und Meer*. It will be edited by the poet Freiligrath, and will appear every three weeks.

—A committee of the Boston City Council has, in answer to a petition, been examining the state of the city's records of births, deaths, and marriages previous to the year 1849. Their conclusion is that from 1630, the date of settlement, to the date just mentioned, "not more than seven per cent. of the births are preserved, about the same percentage of the deaths, and probably about two-thirds of the marriages." The deficiencies in regard to the births occur mainly in the century 1744-1849; the unrecorded deaths, owing to the increase of population, mostly took place during the eighteenth century. The committee then point out the sources from which these lacunæ may be filled. The church records are of course the most important. Although these relate chiefly to church members and their families, "this class during the last two centuries embraced by far the greater part of our (Boston) citizens." The custom of infant baptism gives an especial value to this branch of the records, it being possible to obtain from them "the births of a great number of children with an accuracy of date sufficient for all purposes. In fact," continues the report, "it is to be remembered that in England nothing but baptisms are recorded, and the system of town records of births, like the system of registering deeds, was practically employed in New England as a new plan." Besides making copies of the oldest church records, the inscriptions on the tombstones in the three old graveyards in the city deserve to be carefully collated (they have already been published) and revised; and newspapers (for marriages and deaths), deeds, family records, printed directories, etc., will also repay research and contribute something to the collection of facts. This task is recommended to be entrusted to an unpaid commission of gentlemen skilled in such matters. We are not informed of the action of the Council.

—An esteemed correspondent writes us from Washington: "In noticing Mr. Justice Bradley's proposed arrangement of the calendar, you did not explain the manner in which, by his plan, the year would be divided into four quarters of three months each, exactly corresponding with the four natural divisions of the year made by the sun's arrival at the two equinoxes



and two solstices. Thus, beginning at the winter solstice, when the sun is at the extreme southerly point reached by him, where he commences his return to the north, Judge Bradley would place the new year, or January 1, on the present 21st day of December. Then, giving to January, February, and March each thirty days, the 1st of April, or beginning of the second quarter, will, in common years, fall on the 21st of March, and in leap-years on the 20th of March, or exactly at the vernal equinox, when the sun is on the equinoctial line and the days and nights are equal. Then, giving to the next six months each thirty-one days, the 1st of July, or beginning of the third quarter, will fall in common years on the present 22d of June, and in leap-years on the 21st, which is the summer solstice, when the sun is at his farthest point north and the days are longest; and the 1st of October, or beginning of the fourth quarter, will fall in common years on the 23d of September, and in leap-years on the 22d, which is the autumnal equinox, when the sun recrosses the line and the days and nights are equal again. Then, giving to October and November each thirty days, and to December twenty-nine in common years, and thirty in leap-years, the 1st of January will again fall on the present 21st of December in all cases. This allotment of days to each month is easy to remember, is as convenient as any, and makes them correspond to the great natural phenomena of the sun's annual circuit. It is a lesson in astronomy in itself, and is generally approved as the best plan that has been proposed. The placing of the intercalary day of leap-year at the end of the year would be a great advantage in all astronomical calculations and arrangements of the calendar. And the conformity of the entire civil year to the natural year would of course be an advantage amply sufficient to compensate for any temporary inconvenience arising from the change. No alteration in the recurrence of leap-years from the arrangement of the Gregorian calendar is proposed. That is sufficiently accurate for many centuries to come. The law prepared by Judge Bradley to effect the proposed change, and which was read to the National Academy of Science, is extremely simple and comprehensive, and would obviate all inconveniences of a business character that could possibly arise."

—*Lippincott's* for May is in point of interest an improvement on its predecessor, though we cannot say that there is anything in it which one need regret having missed. The opening paper (one of two), called "Up the Parana and in Paraguay," has attractive illustrations and a disappointing text. We are led to expect a well-garnished tale of personal adventure, and presently discover that we are reading a guide-bookish condensation of a matter-of-fact narrative from the French. A really clever translation from that language is made by Mr. T. S. Perry, who selects an amusing trifle by Gustave Droz, "Behind their Fans." There is an interesting account, full of anecdotes, of the French actor Frédéric Lemaître, by Wirt Sikes; and interesting may be called Mr. Vincent's "Northward to High Asia," though it shares the limitations and defects of his "Land of the White Elephant." It is not every one, for example, who is favored with a sunrise view of the second highest mountain on the globe, nor every one who is capable of painting the scene or expressing fitly the emotions excited by it. "A Story of American Chivalry" is worth reading for the moral of it, but its literary merit is not high. The number of serial articles in *Harper's* gives it a familiar appearance from month to month. We should as soon think of reading Castelar's seventeenth paper on "The Republican Movement in Europe" as the Hon. S. S. Cox's second and final paper on "American Humor." But Professor Rau on the "Stone Age in Europe," and Professor Brewer on "Agricultural Progress" in the instructive and timely series called "The First Century of the Republic," will well repay perusal. The latter is naturally the fresher and more original of the two, but both are clear and popular in style, and exactly in the line of this magazine. Mr. Parton's account of caricature deals this time with the Puritan period, and is curiously illustrated from old prints. Chief of the illustrated articles, however, is Mr. Frederic Hudson's ample story of the Concord fight, with its maps, plans, and pictures of the locality, and autographic facsimiles of Emerson's matchless hymn and of Longfellow's "Midnight Ride of Paul Revere." In his Easy Chair the editor celebrates the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Harper's*, its 300th number, and 50th volume, and justly remarks that if in this long period its general character has not been essentially changed, "it is because the original conception of what a magazine in America should be was so felicitous and accurate." The even editing of *Harper's* has been, perhaps, hardly less remarkable. Of no other of our monthlies is extended criticism so unnecessary, or brief mention so little to be construed as a slight—so much, as a compliment.

—In the *Contemporary* for April, Prof. W. D. Whitney has replied to Prof. Müller's attack upon him (noticed in the *Nation*, No. 504). He sepa-

rates the confused mass of current linguistic theories into two groups, the positive and the metaphysical: the latter starting with grand views of humanity and language and proceeding deductively to its conclusions—the former starting from the audible signs and proceeding inductively to their laws. The first is the critical, the second the imaginative school. Prof. Whitney is of the first; but he admits that the second, to which Müller belongs, is at present the more influential among philologists. According to Prof. Whitney, language is altogether conventional. We call a thing a *book* because other people do, and we can so best convey what we mean; and not because the word is akin to *beech*, and our rude ancestors cut their runes on beechen staves. When we want a word for a new conception, we take a word that we have used with something connected with it. As language grows now, so it always grew; and we are not to fancy that the savage foresaw in his instrument of communication the indispensable means of his mental growth. Language is a body of usages gradually worked out in the strife of the race with its surroundings. It is an institution. It had its origin when sign-making by instinct became sign-making by intelligence. The dog which barks to be let in and then quietly waits our coming, has taken that step; he has some feeble general ideas, but he lacks the capacity to improve. Prof. Müller's personal criticisms Prof. Whitney answers with studied calmness. The charge of abusiveness he of course denies; and he easily shows the weakness of the attack upon him. One instance only we can give. Prof. Müller quotes him as making the startling assertion that "language is almost as little the work of man as is the form of his skull," omitting the modifying clause, "so far as concerns the purposes for which he [the linguist] studies," etc., the whole being part of a statement that "the absence of reflection and conscious interest takes away from the facts of language the subjective character that would otherwise belong to them as products of voluntary action." Garbled extracts such as this are injurious only to the maker.

—By this time we may suppose the semi-annual change of weather consequent on the shifting of the area of greatest cold (from the continent to the sea for the summer, from sea to land for the winter), to have taken place. The approximate date for the summer alternation is May 3, and as evidence that it has taken place in any year the following signs will be found helpful: 1. The sky begins to be often hazy. 2. The temperature never falls below 45°. 3. The temperature is lowest with SE winds, instead of, as during the preceding six months, with NW winds. 4. Rains usually begin with the wind at SW, and clear off with the wind at NE, instead of beginning with wind at SE and clearing off at NW. 5. The regular breeze of clear weather is from ESE, instead of WNW. 6. Snow becomes impossible. 7. Rain comes from the lower clouds, and therefore much more rain falls from the same amount of cloud (so that the intervals of fair weather are longer); whereas, previously, rain fell from higher clouds, and was mostly reabsorbed in the lower strata before reaching the ground. 8. Electric clouds begin to precede storms, and are known by their compact, globular form.

—The Hungarian transit expedition met with a droll mishap, or rather series of mishaps, at Klausenburg. In the first place, the weather was bad, a nasty rain prevailing for days till the night before the transit; then the battery for their chronograph would not work. However, when the day came they managed to get their telescopes in position, their photographic apparatus in order, their heliometer set up, and, with clocks and chronometers clicking and ticking, waited in breathless suspense for the sun to rise. The first contact of Venus and the sun was to be before sunrise, so that only the emersion could be observed. The anxiously-expected sun at last rose, and rose clear. But to their dismay it rose in a very bad place, immediately behind the great tower of the church, and as there was no time to move either instruments or church, the two principal observers were obliged to abandon their observations altogether. All this is recounted, in the gravest scientific language, in the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, apparently without a suspicion of the humor of the situation. "Mr. Nagy, the assistant," says the *Nachrichten*, "who had a portable instrument, clapped it under his arm, went to a place south of the church-tower, and set it up. That instant he saw the limb of the sun and Venus run together." If these worthies should ever go on another scientific expedition, they had better learn the meaning of that expressive verb, *s'orienter, sich orientiren*, or "finding out," as Lowell well puts it, "what is about east, and acting accordingly." As for poor Mr. Nagy, the assistant, instead of scuttling round with his portable instrument under his arm, he would do well to imitate Professor John Phenix, A.M., who "set up his instruments permanently," as he says in his "Official Report on the Central Route," "in a mule-cart, which was backed into the plane of the true meridian when required for use."

—A French law-professor at Dijon, M. Capmas, has discovered a large number of letters—original, and copies—of Mme. de Sévigné, which will afford the means of correcting and enlarging the best edition of this author's works yet published. Hachette is to have the privilege of bringing them out. A more precise account is now given of a similar discovery made about a year ago, namely, of inedited manuscripts of Bossuet and Mlle. de la Vallière. Bossuet's portion consists of the remainder of works hitherto known only in part, and of letters to Mlle. de la Vallière concerning her conversion. The La Vallière MS. is a work composed at this turning-point of her life, and entitled 'Gémissements.' It is said to be remarkable for elevation of thought and for its charming style. The possessor of these interesting papers is a Colonel Ferrel, who had already had the good fortune to discover at Meaux the tomb of Bossuet. Still another *trouvaille* has been the intimate correspondence of Charles VIII. with Louis II. de la Trémoille, having reference to the campaign of 1488 in Brittany. Three hundred copies of these letters, together with five by Anne of Beaujeu and some other pieces, have been printed in the choicest manner by the present Duc de la Trémoille.

—The Paris *Polybiblion*, reviewing the new Index of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, states that the name of F. De Lagenevais, to which sixteen articles are ascribed, is the *nom de guerre* of several different writers, some of whom are revealed in Quérard's 'Supercheries littéraires dévoilées,' and that the Major Fridolin, reputed author of fifteen articles in the same periodical, is really M. De Valbezene, formerly French consul at Calcutta. Among the forty articles classified as anonymous, and mostly political, there is a little story, 'Madame de Marçay,' which the *Polybiblion* thinks there are good reasons for attributing to Prévost-Paradol.

—Foreign papers record the accidental death (April 4) of Karl Mauch, one of the foremost of the minor African explorers. Mauch went out to Africa in 1864, but lack of means prevented any great expedition at first, and he devoted himself to cartographic studies of the South African (popularly but incorrectly called the Transvaal) Republic. He furnished a very considerable portion of the material with which Jeppy and Merensky prepared their map. Early in 1866 he met the elephant-hunter Hartley, and made two expeditions with him in that and the following year into the Matebele country, which taught him how to travel and resulted in the discovery of two gold-fields. A private expedition which he undertook the next year, whose real field was to be Central Africa, broke down completely on account of the failure of a friend to co-operate as promised. At the end of July, 1871, he began his last and most interesting journey through the country between the Limpopo and the Zambesi, unexplored since the region south of Sena was visited by Galvao da Silva in 1788. Mauch had very much to endure in the way of imprisonment or robbery, and was obliged to spend nine months among the Makalaka. It was during this time, September, 1871, that he discovered the ruins of Zimbabwe, with which his name will always be associated. These ruins, about 200 miles west of Sofala, are of stone—a fact of singular significance among nations where only huts and walls of mud are known. Mauch's own view was that he was in the land of Ophir, for he found another gold-field not far away, and heard of strange animal-sacrifices made here at intervals of several years, which bore a remarkable resemblance to those of the Jews. This view has, however, found no favor among the learned. Mauch finally reached Sena in the middle of 1872, and returned to Germany the same year. One cannot but admire the courage of the man, and regret that ample means and proper training (he was self-taught in those branches which are indispensable to a good explorer) were wanting to make him a truly successful traveller. Much of his work has a permanent value, and he has opened a very promising field to future explorers. His own reports of his work appeared in various numbers of Petermann's *Mittheilungen*, 1867-71. A general narrative of his South African experiences and a tolerably full account of his last journey may be found in a recent *Ergänzungsheft*, No. 37, to the *Mittheilungen*. Mauch was born in 1837, in Ludwigsburg. The manner of his death was sad.

—The Kauffuss'sche Buchhandlung of Liegnitz (Prussia) has undertaken the publication of a unique magazine, *Der Antikritiker, Organ für literarische Vertheiligung*. This is to be a refuge for discontented authors whose books have met with adverse criticism, and who cannot get their replies gratuitously published. In other words, the principle of co-operation is to be applied to the printing of replies to the critics. The unpleasant problem of support is ingeniously solved by permitting the writers to pay about four-fifths of the expense of publication, while the public is further allowed to pay fairly for its reading privileges. German authors are so human and so fond of controversy that we should presume there would be

no lack of material for the *Antikritiker*, and, in view of the bitterness of German *Fedekriege*, intending subscribers are sure of spicy reading; indeed, the preface of the first number suggests that the warmer the replies, the better. As to the permanent value of such a publication we have our decided doubts. A temperately-conducted journal that would present the other side in cases of excessive criticism, or could offer authors a good opportunity to defend themselves, would be a decided gain. The *Antikritiker*, however, seems to have no editorial supervision or plan (except to avoid prosecution under the press law), and the excessive polemic of the first number against Zarncke's *Literarisches Centralblatt* and the *Jenae Literaturzeitung* certainly proves too much. The intellectual godfather of the undertaking (who, we suspect, plays a more prominent part than the prospectus and title-page intimate) is a Prussian local medical inspector and writer, who has a rather bad reputation, we believe, on account of his literary quarrels—a fact that is not full of promise for the *Antikritiker*.

#### MRS. GILBERT'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.\*

WHAT gives its peculiar charm to this book? This question is not easy to answer offhand. Ann and Jane Taylor have a deserved reputation as the poets of the nursery, but the best-known of their productions, such as "Twinkle, twinkle, little star," are the work of the younger sister, and a desire to know something about the lady who has taught child after child to give thanks that he "was not born a little slave to labor in the sun," is scarcely of itself a sufficient inducement to undertake the perusal of two volumes of biographical reminiscences. A history of religious experiences has, it may be admitted, a genuine interest for all who either sympathize with or care to study the religious sentiment. But Mrs. Gilbert's autobiography, though written by a profoundly pious woman, is not an account of religious experiences. The very honesty of her nature made her dread the habit of "keeping" a diary of religious experience. "To me," she writes, "it appears impossible that this should be honestly done. Much that generally enters into it should pass under the eye of God alone, and to the writer and the reader is almost equally injurious." There are passages of the work which give an indirect glimpse of the writer's painful anxiety with regard to the spiritual condition of herself and of her friends. But these passages, suggestive of reflection as they are, do not form the staple of the book. It is chiefly a picture of life drawn by a woman at once profoundly impressed with religious beliefs and sentiments, and also interested with a keen interest in outward nature, and endowed with the capacity to observe and note all that passed around her.

The most obvious cause of the favor with which these annals of an uneventful life have been received by a public who have half forgotten the writings of the Misses Taylor of Ongar, is the skill displayed by Mrs. Gilbert in narrating the details of her own life. Her prose writings, and especially her autobiography, give a far higher impression of her power as a writer than the poems on which, to the end of her life, she looked with an amiable and honest complacency, which was gently ruffled when the ignorance of strangers ascribed the whole merit of the well-known songs and hymns to Jane, and forgot that Ann Taylor had also a claim to some share of the reputation gained by the joint labors of the two. Mrs. Gilbert happily belonged to a generation which had not learnt the odious art of "word-painting," and every scene she describes is told in the simplest language, without any attempt to make the details of ordinary life the basis on which to erect a mass of wordy prettinesses. But for the power of sketching truthfully the beauties of the country, the salient features of character, the little humors and traits which give point and vividness, when once they are noticed, to the most ordinary events of daily life, she compares favorably with our best modern writers. Mr. Stridling, the blacksmith, who looked "so very ugly," and, though stone deaf, troubled his minister by complaining of him as a "legal preacher," on the ground that he selected Arminian texts; Mr. Hickman, the minister in straitened circumstances, who, when he wished to borrow a few pounds from Isaac Taylor, used to walk into the house and intimate the extent of his needs by the number of fingers he laid on the table; Mr. Watkinson, the wealthy member of the congregation, who walked on wet days, tall and erect, in pattens, protected from the rain by the newly-invented article—an umbrella; Mr. Meeking, the good-natured, fresh-colored baker, of whose hot toast, "thick heaped and sodden with butter," Mrs. Gilbert at the age of sixty retained a grateful recollection—these, and twenty or thirty other portraits, all drawn with the same discriminating humor, stand before the reader in as clearly-marked outline as the characters in 'Cranford' or in the 'Mill on the Floss.'

\* 'Autobiography and Other Memorials of Mrs. Gilbert (formerly Ann Taylor). By Josiah Gilbert.' London: Henry S. King & Co.



The description, again, of the childhood of "Naney and Jenny," of their brothers and sisters, of their mother, and above all of their father, are in their way perfect pictures of home-life. Isaac Taylor the younger (the author of the 'History of Enthusiasm') and Jane and Ann will always be better known than the father and mother from whom they derive all they had of genius and, so far as such a thing can be derived from others, all that was peculiar in their type of goodness. Mrs. Gilbert's autobiography would indeed well deserve all the popularity it has achieved had it no other merit than that of painting the character of her father. Of her father, as of every other person or thing with which she deals, Mrs. Gilbert writes with the utmost simplicity and directness. Her unbounded love and admiration for him do not lead her into the folly of heaping eulogy on virtues and talents which speak clearly enough for themselves, yet students who carefully observe the traits by which Isaac Taylor, the engraver and minister, is revealed indirectly in his daughter's pages, for the instruction and admiration of all who can appreciate goodness and originality, cannot but feel as though they were reading of a character of romance painted by a skilful novelist. Caleb Garth, David Elginbrod, above all the minister in 'Cousin Phyllis' (the most graceful of all Mrs. Gaskell's tales), have each something in common with Isaac Taylor. You seem to see in him the reality of which the fancied pictures are the shadow. And when this is perceived, the question wherein does the charm of Mrs. Gilbert's autobiography consist, is more than half answered. To paint home-life is a rare talent, but the picture painted is of no worth unless the home-life be worth recording. And what gives the interest to the autobiography is that Mrs. Gilbert not only describes, with rare fidelity, country life in England as it existed more than sixty years ago, but also paints a family in each of whom there existed in combination qualities which are not only admirable in themselves, but are in fact rarely found in complete union.

The character of Isaac Taylor the elder was inherited in different degrees by his children, and, together with the almost equally remarkable character of Mrs. Taylor, gave the tone to the whole household. Mrs. Gilbert thus writes of her father: "At thirteen he commenced a life which became one of diffusive piety. At sixteen he joined the church under the Rev. Mr. Webb of Fetter Lane, and from these early years till he went down to the grave at seventy-one, his character was one beautiful progress through the benignant graces of Christianity. His love of knowledge was early strong and universal; nothing was uninteresting to him that he had opportunity to acquire, and when acquired his delight was to communicate. Apt to teach he certainly was. All his methods were self-devised, and the life of few men devoted to teaching as a profession would have accomplished more than he attained by husbanding the half-hours of his own." The noticeable point in these sentences is that they point to a union which is rare of fervent piety with what may be termed the scientific and inventive cast of mind. Moreover, in Isaac Taylor and in his descendants these characteristics were not combined only, but really fused together. No reader of religious biographies can fail to have observed that there are cases in which religious interests seem to have absorbed all the energies of a man's soul, and to have rendered him indifferent to speculations or investigations which do not directly belong to the sphere of religion; and observation of life itself is sufficient to show that in the minds of many persons, whose genuine religious feelings and belief it would be folly to doubt, there exists a division between their religious and secular interests. In either case the character suffers. In the first it is dwarfed, or stunted, on one side. In the other it lacks the sincerity and simplicity which can hardly coexist with a divided mind. The special beauty of Isaac Taylor and of his children is the perfect sincerity and simplicity which arise from the harmonious development of the whole of the intellectual and spiritual nature. Thus he continued through life both an engraver and a minister, though, if we understand Mrs. Gilbert rightly, towards the latter part of his life he was almost wholly devoted to ministerial duties. But there never appears to have been in his own judgment or in that of any of his children the least incongruity between the practice of his trade and his work as a minister. In each case he did with all his power the duty set before him, and would, we may conjecture, have been at once amused and indignant at the views of any man who had told him that the performance of the one duty was in any sense inconsistent with the performance of the other. It is easy to conjecture the sort of reply which he would have made, from the answer which he in fact gave to certain members of his congregation who objected that he did not confine himself to preaching what they were pleased to consider the " Gospel."

The piety, intellectual energy, and perfect simplicity of Mr. Taylor's character are remarkable enough in themselves. But they deserve special attention on the part of a critic of Mrs. Gilbert's autobiography, because

the same qualities form the basis of her character. Intellectually, she was, it may be suspected, considerably her father's inferior. He possessed a breadth and calmness of mind which certainly were wanting in his daughter. She apparently inherited from her mother an anxious conscientiousness, which must, as appears from one or two traits, have caused her bitter suffering throughout life. Her fearful and lasting anxiety as to the final condition of a child who died when young; her candid statement of the fact that, except for one short period, she had never been able to find the religious peace for which she constantly sought, point to a gloomy side of her character and to features in her religious creed which, were this the place for theological discussion, ought to receive careful consideration. But her intensely strong feelings, both of affection and of pleasure, her love of work, her delight in all the life around her, her perfect honesty of purpose and of intellect, are the reproduction of her father's best qualities. This honesty, in fact, is the salient trait both of her moral character and of her literary work. It is hard now to realize, even in imagination, the time when 'Cælebs' was the "book of the day," and Hannah More an authority whose doctrine was almost above question. It is, however, characteristic of Mrs. Gilbert that she should, when young, have criticised a manifest inconsistency in Mrs. More's 'Christian Morals' with a freedom and directness which made the "distinguished authoress" express "her displeasure in a manner unworthy of her genius." It is characteristic of the same honesty and simplicity that throughout the whole of her autobiography Mrs. Gilbert never for a moment divides her religious reflections from the course of her narrative. Religion and life are with her, as with her father, far too closely blended to be in any way separated as belonging to different spheres of thought. Her account, for example, of the Forbeses runs into a discussion on special providences, which is immediately followed by an account of the way in which "Jane and I began the arduous experiments of making our own dresses." Her honesty and insight are the qualities that have enabled her to produce an autobiography which, combined with the memorials admirably put together by her son, constitutes the best picture we have ever seen of the fair and noble side of English Dissent. The Nonconformists have received hard measure from the English public. It is well that the coarse caricatures, such as Chadband, and the Shepherd, or the hard satire of 'The Chronicles of Carlingford,' should be met by the truthful portraits of Mr. Taylor of Ongar and of his daughters.

#### THOMPSON'S NATIONAL ECONOMY.\*

PROFESSOR THOMPSON belongs to what is best known as the Philadelphia school of political economy, a school of which Mr. H. C. Carey is the acknowledged head, and most of the literature of which, so far as we know, emanates from that gentleman's native city. The term "National system," first used by List, is, however, adopted in the work now before us, as also the very objectionable one of "American and German school." If the application of the latter term has any other object than that of deceiving the youthful reader into the belief that the doctrines of this school are generally received in Germany, we should like to know it.

The first question which arises on examining a work of this school is whether the author can give us any clear, concise, and definite statement of his principles which shall show the relation of these principles to the facts of life. An inability to do this seems to be the general characteristic of Mr. Carey and his followers. They state facts in sufficient number, and explain their opinions at great length; but the connection between the facts and opinions is always left in a very shadowy state, and the subject is generally discussed more in the spirit of the partisan than in that of the philosopher. We are glad to see that in the general tone of the work Mr. Thompson is an improvement on his predecessors. His righteous indignation against the opposing school is not such as to prevent his discussing the subject with a show of calmness through at least the first half of the work. He gives a critical description of the methods of the various schools of the science, which, though entirely inadequate, is obviously meant to be fair and unprejudiced, and affords a crumb of satisfaction to the critic who has been vainly searching through the volumes of Mr. Carey to find a gleam of impartiality or good-sense. The school formed by Adam Smith, whose methods are now followed by the leading writers of all civilized countries, he calls the Cosmopolitan school, and he objects to it that it practically ignores the division of mankind into nations. From a protectionist point of view this is the fact, and the answer that would be made to the objection by the school is that, as applied to the particular question in the mind of the objector—namely, that of protection or free-trade—the division of mankind

\* Social Science and National Economy. By Robt. Ellis Thompson, M.A., Professor of Social Science in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates.

into nations is, from a purely economic point of view, non-essential. The position of the parties is similar to that of two neighbors, one of whom refuses to buy of the grocer who has the best and cheapest supply of goods from purely personal objections to him. The other, arguing that the grocer who sells the cheapest is the most profitable to deal with, is told that he ignores the facts that the man has red hair and beats his wife.

The most encouraging paragraph of all is on page 31, where a faint conception of the real difference between the Philadelphia and the Cosmopolitan schools is clearly indicated. Instead of the deductive method of the mathematical sciences adopted by the English school, he would "apply the inductive method of observation and generalization, which has produced such brilliant results in the natural sciences." Now, when we clear away the great mass of vague assertion with which the writings of the Philadelphia school are loaded, we find that the last sentence expresses with sufficient accuracy what is peculiar in the method which it adopts. Progress in the natural sciences consists in the discovery of certain laws, in blind obedience to which all natural events occur. When we say blind, we mean that the events occur without regard to consequences. If a barrel of powder is touched by a spark, it explodes as instantly and as certainly in the midst of a Sunday-school as on the open plain. If the whole human race were so situated as to be destroyed by the explosion, that fact would not delay it a moment. Were the acts of mankind governed by laws of this same nature, we should certainly have to apply the methods of the physical sciences in order to investigate them with success. Political economy, being concerned in investigating the consequences and the laws of human action, would then have to be pursued by the same methods. But every one knows that human acts are not, either individually or in the mass, governed by any such laws. There are no natural laws under which a steamship must leave port on a certain day, and be loaded with certain goods; a railway be built between certain points; a city arise in a certain region, or goods be imported from certain markets. The steamship leaves one port in order to reach another, and, to prevent her from leaving, a simple despatch that the first port was destroyed would be sufficient. A factory arises in a city, not in blind obedience to a law, but because the builders, after careful calculation, see a prospect of improving their condition by means of it. Hence any system which regards industrial phenomena, such as the rise of factories, the improvement of agriculture, and the extension of trade, as results of laws similar to those under which powder explodes and trees grow, can lead to nothing but confusion.

That which distinguishes the school of Adam Smith from the one now under consideration is not the doctrines which it teaches, but the recognition of the difference we have sought to elucidate. Its writers disagree on many minor points, but agree in considering man as a being able to take care of himself, and desirous of making a living, and of getting rich if he can, while all industrial phenomena are viewed as results of this propensity. He cultivates the ground, not because it is a natural law that the ground must be cultivated, but in order to secure a supply of food. They consider him also as a being of sufficient shrewdness to adopt the best attainable method of securing food, clothing, and home comforts. If, instead of making his coat at his own home, he sends across the ocean to a foreign pauper for it, it is because he finds that, after paying all expenses, he gets it cheaper than by making it himself. If the foreign capitalist sells him the coat at less than cost, for the purpose of destroying his factory, and of inundating him with cheap clothing, he will buy as long as the capitalist plays such a losing game, and when that unwise enemy puts up the price he will cease to buy, and, having a year's supply of clothing on hand, he will start his own factory going again.

A very good illustration of the difference between the two schools is afforded by Mr. Carey's favorite law of the occupation of the earth, to which Mr. Thompson devotes an entire chapter. This law is that poor soils are always cultivated first, and that agriculture always spreads to richer ones. A follower of Smith, even if he admitted the facts, would deny the existence of any such law. He would allege that the first settlers would always choose the richest soil which they were able to cultivate, and if, in any particular case, this should happen to be the poorest one, it would be simply because there was some material obstacle to the cultivation of the others. This would reduce the question to the purely physical one whether, as a matter of fact, soils are everywhere difficult to reclaim and cultivate in exact proportion to their fertility. But, in lieu of considering this question, our author follows Mr. Carey in seeking to trace the movements of population during the prehistoric ages, and professing to know exactly what regions were then most fertile, he declares that they were always the last to be settled. The conclusion is, that by an inexorable law, like that by which water flows downward, whenever a new country is peopled the settlers must begin by

cultivating the poorest soil they can find, and gradually pass to that which is more fertile.

In a negative way, the work is a decided improvement on the writings of Mr. Carey. There is less bitterness of feeling, fewer paradoxes, and some respect for notorious facts. But of positive merits there are none. We find the same want of clear and definite statement, the same dreary repetition of vague and meaningless generalities, the same propensity to judge everything by the one shibboleth of protection, and the same absence of any consistent system of views on questions of currency, which characterize the writings of his predecessors. Much of the chapter on currency is written, unintentionally perhaps, on the Talleyrandian principle, under a supposed necessity for saying something. What shall we say to an author who complains of our national banking system that under it

"A vast amount of money is paid in transactions between distant parts of the nation by the cumbersome and expensive method of drawing and negotiating bills of exchange. The sales of the Western crops and the purchase of Eastern goods in exchange is [sic] actually carried on as if it were a transaction between the merchants of two different nations, and sometimes at an expense of several per cent. premium or discount to business men"?

Apart from all questions of governmental policy, which do not constitute an integral part of political economy as a science, the spectacle of a class of students in a university being fed with such mental food as this is by no means a cheering one. It seems impossible to find a writer who, while in favor of protection, or at least not an advocate of free-trade, shall still be able to give a fair and clear account of the method of reasoning in social science, and of how causes operate in the business world.

---

*The Romance of the Association; or, One Last Glimpse of Charlotte Temple and Eliza Wharton. A curiosity of literature and life. By Mrs. Dall. (Cambridge: J. Wilson & Son. 1875. Sm. 8vo, pp. 102.)*—Mrs. Dall came into possession of some dozen or more letters written by Elizabeth Whitman, and decided wisely that they would interest many who had heard of the heroine of a New England tragedy of the last century. Miss Whitman was a belle of Hartford a hundred years ago, the daughter of Rev. Elnathan W. and Abigail (Stanley) his wife. In 1778, Elizabeth started for Boston, ostensibly to visit friends, but never arrived there; later it was found that she had died in Danvers, having given birth to a dead child. Scandal was triumphant, as she had never confessed a marriage, though to her newly-formed friends at Danvers the unknown always asserted that she was a wife. A Mrs. Forster, of Watertown, wrought the facts and fancies into a novel, which had a great vogue, called 'Eliza Wharton; or, The Coquette.' As Miss Whitman had been betrothed to Rev. Joseph Buckminster, and as Pierrepont Edwards was pointed at as the father of the child, the story spread like wildfire.

Not only did Mrs. Dall obtain the letters, but she witnessed the reunion of one of the family with a long-parted friend, which happened by chance at a meeting of the American Association at Hartford in 1874. The happy meeting was doubtless very pleasant to the persons interested, but it is made the occasion by Mrs. Dall of a needless amount of gush. The letters are not very important, but their publication was a sensible idea. What we have to complain of, however, is her taking occasion to turn the matter into a long and rambling discussion of her own thoughts and feelings. Besides this, we have to complain seriously of Mrs. Dall's attempts to falsify the history of families. Eliza Whitman's maternal grandfather was Colonel Nathaniel Stanley, Treasurer of the Colony. He was descended from a Thomas Stanley, who came here with a brother Timothy; a third brother, John, dying on the passage. Another of his descendants was Charlotte Stanley, who was seduced in 1774 by an officer in the British army, and who was the heroine of a novel called 'Charlotte Temple.' At least we say that she was of this family on the authority of Mrs. Dall, who writes that "Charlotte was a near cousin of the mother of Eliza" Whitman. Mrs. Dall strives to impress her readers with the idea that these Connecticut Stanleys were of the family of the Earl of Derby. She calls the two ladies, Charlotte and Elizabeth, "women of the Stanley blood, descendants of the Great Earl, King of Man, and Charlotte de la Tremouille." Here we touch a definite statement; but James, seventh Earl of Derby, who married Charlotte de la Tremouille, was born in 1606 and was beheaded in 1651. Now, Thomas Stanley of Hartford is considered by Savage to be the emigrant who came over in the *Planter* in 1635, aged sixteen. Hence he was born in 1619, and could hardly be the son of the Earl, who was but thirteen years his senior. Even in profligate England, peers are rarely fathers at the age of thirteen. The eighth Earl, Charles, son of James, was born in 1627, and his two sons succeeded in turn: then, in 1733, the title went to a far



away cousin, descended from the first Earl. What a pity it was not known that no less than three sons of the seventh Earl had emigrated to America and had left issue! Again, Mrs. Dall weaves some incomprehensible fancy about the Harts of Hartford as connections of Shakspeare, and Thomas Stanley, of Tonge Castle in Shropshire, second son of the third Earl of Derby, and Thomas Stanley of Hartford. This is above our intelligence. Next she writes that soon after "Thomas Stanley was laid to rest, a daughter of William Harris married William Pierrepont, last Duke of Kingston," from whom sprang Sarah Pierrepont, wife of Jonathan Edwards, mother of Pierrepont Edwards. Now, the last Duke of Kingston was Evelyn Pierrepont, who married the notorious Miss Chudleigh, and died without issue in 1773, when his sister's son inherited his property. There was never a William Pierrepont, Duke of Kingston, and of the Earls of Kingston none married a Harris. What Mrs. Dall has in her mind is possibly an unfounded claim of the American Pierponts to belong to some branch of the English ducal family.

But it is hard to reason with a genealogist who writes:

"If a Puritan son came to New England with his family, the angry Cavalier left his name standing on the household book awhile. If the same man returned in 1640 (!) to take part with Oliver Cromwell, the unhappy father wrote against the name 'dead *sine prole*,' and this fact, not always capable of proof, when encountered at the Herald's office, is one great obstacle to establishing an American pedigree."

We do not well know what to call this story; it is at least absurd. If any American refuses to accept official records as a bar to a theoretical pedigree, he or she is not of the fraternity of genealogists. Mrs. Dall has offended in this way before. Three years ago she wrote to the journals that her ancestor, Thomas Wells, owned and founded the town of Wells, in Maine. The historian of the place, the late E. E. Bourne, showed conclusively that this was altogether wrong. In still later writings she has put forth other mistaken pedigrees. The object of her present book was a good one, but while we can pardon her rhapsodies about Eliza Wharton, we cannot tolerate this false claim of a noble pedigree for a quiet and well-behaved New England family. Another generation may accept it for truth.

*What Young People should Know.* The Reproductive Function in Man and the Lower Animals. By Burt G. Wilder. "Honi soit qui mal y pense." (Boston: Estes & Lauriat.)—"The complete title of this little work," says Prof. Wilder in his preface, "should be 'Some of the Things Young People should Know.'" But, to be exactly descriptive, the title must undergo still further emendation, so as to read, 'Some of the Things Some Young People should Know.' We insist upon this limitation, not because the author has offended against propriety or common prudence (as we suppose) in any respect, but because the physiological exposition, which occupies three-quarters of the text, is so technical in its method and its terminology as to resemble and really to constitute a lecture to medical students. They alone are capable of feeling an interest in or of understanding all the points of the discussion, which contains so much that is not merely unnecessary, but almost pedantic, that of medical students alone can it be fairly said that they "should know" anything about it. But to this class there is certainly no need of apologizing for treating a subject which is universally tabooed in common-school text-books, and the motto "honi soit" appears to be quite gratuitous. We have taken an indirect way of saying that Prof. Wilder has failed to popularize the instruction he wishes to convey, and one cannot help thinking how much better his master, Prof. Wyman, would have succeeded in this task—if it were possible to conceive of his undertaking it—when one suddenly comes upon a tribute to him (p. 52) which has no earthly connection with the chapter in which it is interpolated as a foot-note. On the other hand, fancy that great teacher saying, in a treatise like this, of a certain function: "No satisfactory explanation has, as yet, been offered. Certain facts in Comparative Anatomy and Physiology have led me to entertain a new view of its purpose, but I am not yet ready to publish it." This sounds a little odd, both from the intrusion of the author's personality and on other accounts. But it is not so queer an illustration of his regard for the doctrine of final causes as the passage on p. 42, where we read, of the arrangement of certain organs, that it "is offensive and apparently uncalled for. . . . We must conclude, however, that some deep significance attaches to this association," etc., etc.

In the second or ethical portion of the work there is much less to take exception to, and much to commend, though it is not entirely to our mind. Some things not in it we would have said, and some things in it we would have left unsaid. But the author's earnestness and purity of motive are here made so manifest as to disarm any criticism stronger than an expres-

sion of disappointment. That feeling we can but have for the book as a whole, believing that its usefulness is greatly restricted, and that the author's intention to gain the ear of all "young unmarried persons of both sexes" will not be realized. Medical students, as we have said, and parents, at least for their children's sake, may find instruction and profit in it.

*The Land of the Czar.* By O. W. Wahl. (London: Chapman & Hall; New York: Scribner, Welford & Armstrong.)—This is a stout octavo volume of 400 pages, replete with information about Russia, and very convenient for reference. An account of the various peoples embraced in the Empire occupies more than half of the work. This is followed by a summary review of Russian history down to the present reign; and chapters on the church, and on the languages and literature of the country, fill out the scheme of the author. Herr Wahl is an apologist for Russia, but evidently a simple-minded and not a paid defender. The moderation of his judgment of her rulers and her policy is unmistakable naïveté, and not vulgar whitewash. This makes his historical narrative amusing when otherwise it would be hopelessly dry and unattractive. Much more readable are the earlier and the later portions of the book, especially the survey of Russian literature, which, if it does not inspire us with a very high respect for the author's critical ability, lays us under no little obligation to him for the information which it contains.

What most mars the usefulness of this compendium, apart from the want of method pervading the whole, is the faulty idiom in which it is composed, and the un-English and unscientific spelling of Russian proper names. The idiom is occasionally too bad to excuse even in the proof-reader, let alone the publishers. Ungrammatical sentences, too, like this (p. 333): "The great guide to a just appreciation of the intellectual life of nations are their languages and literature," are much too common; and once in a while one meets with an extraordinary effort like the following: "The Russian Monarchy of our days, into the colossal proportions of which the preceding chapters have given the reader some insight—if now it extends over 500,000 square miles—in the year 1462, it possessed but 18,500." The punctuation is frequently, as in the instance just cited, discreditable to everybody but the author. His spelling is by turns German, French, English, and Russian, the German forms naturally predominating; and the inconsistency is of course very great. The great Tartar chief, whose multifarious name is perhaps most familiar to English eyes as Genghis Khan, appears here on page 270 and generally as *Tehinggis-Khan*, in the index without the hyphen, and on page 358 as *Tshinggis Khan*. This spelling is as distinctly German as the Gotha geographers' *Udschidschi* for Livingstone's Ujiji. The Russian general whom English usage calls Suwarow, Herr Wahl or his translator calls *Souwarov*, a better spelling than the former in some respects, but mongrel at best, and having the fault of ending in *r*, instead of in *f* or *ff*, which the best usage now reserves for proper names of persons. The opposite fault is exhibited in *Kieff* (page 355). For the familiar Janissaries we have *Yanitschars*; *Vallachia* for Wallachia; on the same page (266) *Yaroslav* and *Jaroslav*; on page 300, *Dnepr*, on page 306, *Njemen*. Forms like *Mithridat* for Mithridates, and *Kreml* for Kremlin may also be pointed out; and finally, not to multiply examples, for *Donski* Cossacks (page 289), and *Kubanski* Tartars (page 290), the English idiom would have been content with Don Cossacks, etc.

*Un Vaincu.* Souvenirs du Général Robert Lee. Par Mme. B. Boissonnas. (Paris: Hetzel et Cie.; New York: F. W. Christern.)—It would not be easy to name a book more cordially to be commended to those who desire a general knowledge of our war than this one. To those who like biography, and who are fond of reading French, it presents especial attractions. It is most agreeably written, and its convenient size, good paper, and clear print make it welcome to the hand and eye. It is gracefully dedicated to the sons of the authoress. She says to them: "J'aime les braves gens, je crois qu'il y a toujours à gagner en la compagnie des nobles âmes," but she tells them frankly that "her hero" fought for the South—"la terre de l'esclavage"; and adds, on a later page, "Parce que sa croyance était sincère, parce que son erreur était loyale, nous osons, sans cacher nos regrets, réclamer pour lui le profond respect de tous les gens de cœur." It is touching and striking to find the following sentiment expressed by a woman of the vanquished French race: "Il avait un de ces caractères rares chez tous les peuples, et que notre pays devra produire s'il se soucie de recouvrer sa force: une de ces natures où la fermeté n'a pas besoin d'illusions."

The book is a biography of General Lee from his birth to his death, but two-thirds of it are devoted to the war of Secession and to the part

which he played in it. It is a very good account of the operations of the Army of the Potomac and of the Army of Northern Virginia, and a surprisingly good one to have been written by a foreigner and a woman; for, with all women's gifts of composition, their nature and their education do not qualify them for the composition of military books. It has many inaccuracies, but that is natural, and we will not dwell upon them further than to warn the uninstructed reader not to accept the repeated statement that Grant and Meade commanded distinct armies in the Virginia campaign of 1864-5, and to say that Gen. Hooker, though disgracefully beaten at Chancellorsville, carried off many scores more than "un seul canon" when he crossed the Rappahannock in retreat. We have read 'Un Vaincu' with interest and pleasure, and we hope that many readers of the *Nation* will see for themselves whether they are not rewarded for the purchase of it.

*De Laudibus Legum Angliæ.* By Chancellor Sir John Fortescue. With notes by Andrew Amos, and life by Lord Clermont. (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.)—This is a publication which we have too long delayed noticing. The house of Robert Clarke & Co. have published a number of legal classics from time to time, and laid not only the profession of the law but the public under obligations to them for the excellent manner in which the work has been done. Fortescue's treatise was selected as the third of their series, and Amos's edition of 1825 was chosen for republication. The publishers, fortunately before it was too late, heard of Lord Clermont's privately printed edition of Fortescue's life and works, and through him obtained a copy for use in the preparation of the book for the press. The Cincinnati edition therefore contains Lord Clermont's "carefully corrected revision of both text and translation," Amos's notes, and Lord Clermont's life. The book itself is so well known that little need be said of it. It is one of those classics which every lawyer is supposed to read, though few can with truth say that they have accomplished this task, and their very stings of conscience make them desire to possess it. Fortescue was Chief-Justice and Chancellor to Henry the Sixth, and his life belongs to the stormy period of the fifteenth century, his fidelity and devotion to the Lancastrian party lasting till the battle of Tewkesbury and the murder of Henry and the death of his son placed Edward the Fourth in possession of the kingdom. When Fortescue was taken prisoner, Edward pardoned him and restored his estates, on the humiliating condition that he should recant or rather refute his own arguments proving the right of the House of Lancaster to the throne. Intellectually, this was not very difficult to do, for the arguments on either side were of a very general and inconclusive kind, drawn mainly from the

Scriptures. He had previously proved that Edward had no right to the throne as claiming it through the female line, and, inasmuch as the Bible and the Fathers were unanimous upon the point that man was ordained to be above woman, it seemed clear enough that Edward had no title; but he now discovered his mistake, and saw that such passages as that in Genesis, "thou shalt be under the power of man, and he shall be thy lord," were capable of an explanation in no way conflicting with Edward's title, for it meant, not that a woman should be under the power of all men, or of many men, but that she should be under the power of some man; "and that every woman is under the power and lordship of some one man . . . may not be denied, for every woman is under the power and lordship of the Pope, which is a man and the Vicar of Christ, God and man." It must not be supposed from this, however, that Sir John Fortescue was a sycophant or a time-server, for he had given, in exile and suffering on behalf of his old master, many proofs to the contrary. But he felt, probably, that the struggle was over, and that it was not the part of a wise man to protract it further. The treatise 'De Laudibus' was composed by Fortescue, when in exile, for the benefit of the young prince, Henry's son, and takes the form of a dialogue between the two, in which the old Chief-Justice sets forth to the young man the glories of the common law, explains to him the differences between it and the civil law, and, it is needless to add, effectually convinces his pupil of the inferiority of the latter. No good lawyer would teach law now in this way; indeed, many a page of Fortescue might be taken as an excellent example of the way not to teach law. Nevertheless, and partly on that very account, the book is the more interesting and, as a classic, valuable.

\*. Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

## BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices
Beal (S.), The Romantic Legend of Sakya Buddha, swd.	(Trübner & Co.) 1 25
Blackwell (Mrs. A. R.), The Sexes throughout Nature.	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 50
Evers (H.), Navigation in Theory and Practice.	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 25
Egginton (G. C.), How to Make a Living.	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 0 40
Fyffe (C. A.), History of Greece (History Primers)	(Macmillan & Co.) 0 40
Förster (E.), Peter von Cornelius, swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Hirsch (A.), Verhütung und Bekämpfung der Volkskrankheiten, swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Jordan (Dr. W.), Geographische Resultaten der Expedition in die libysche Wüste, swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Jouault (A.), Abraham Lincoln.	(F. W. Christern)
Lloyd (F.) and Newton (W. N.), Prussia's Representative Man.	(Trübner & Co.)
Laas (Prof. E.), Gymnasium und Realschule, swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Nashir (Dr. S.), Wissenschaftliche Vorträge, swd.	(L. W. Schmidt)
Stowe (Mrs. H. B.), We and Our Neighbors.	(J. B. Ford & Co.) 1 75
The Best Reading, revised edition.	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 50
U. S. Patent Association's Publications, Vol. I.	(J. R. Osgood & Co.)
Whitney (Prof. J. D.), Yosemite Guide-book, new ed.	(Callifornia)
Wood (Rev. J. G.), Man and Beast Here and Hereafter.	(Geo. Routledge & Sons)

## SECOND EDITION.

"The best novel of the spring."  
—Tribune.

Mr. Smith.

A Part of his Life. A Novel. By L. B. Walford. 16mo.  
Leisure Hour Series, \$1 25.

## RECENT STANDARD PUBLICATIONS.

Taine's Notes on Paris. \$2 50.  
Sainte-Beuve's English Portraits. \$2.  
Maine's Early History of Institutions. \$3.  
Jones's Africa. \$5.  
Sumner's American Currency. \$3.  
Moscheles's Recent Music and Musicians. \$2.  
Deutsch's Talmud and other Literary Remains. \$4.  
Conway's Sacred Anthology. \$4.  
Chesney's Military Biography. \$2 50.  
Gautier's A Winter in Russia. \$2.  
Adams's Democracy and Monarchy in France. \$2 50.  
Mill's Three Essays on Religion. \$2 50.

RECENT AND FAVORITE VOLUMES OF THE  
LEISURE HOUR SERIES.

Price \$1 25 each.

Alexander, Mrs.—Ralph Wilton's Weird.  
Fraser-Tytler, C. C.—Mistress Judith.  
Alexander, Mrs.—The Wining O'L.  
Alexander, Mrs.—Which Shall It Be?  
Alcestis, A Musical Novel.  
Hardy, Thos.—Far from the Madding Crowd.  
Hardy, Thos.—A Pair of Blue Eyes.  
About, E.—The Notary's Nose.  
Craven, Mme.—Fleurange.  
My Little Lady.  
Parr, Louisa—Hero Carthew.  
Richardson—Clarissa Harlowe (condensed).

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

**Starr & Marcus,**  
Jewellers and Silversmiths.

## DIAMONDS AND GEMS.

*Works of Art in Stone*  
*Cameos.*

BRONZES, CLOCKS, AND ORNAMENTS.

22 John Street, New York.

**RARE AND VALUABLE BOOKS,**  
AT ENGLISH BOOKSTALL PRICES.

Now ready, Catalogue No. 5, free on application.  
JOHN EVANS, Importer,  
318 Hudson Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

**F. W. CHRISTERN,**  
FOREIGN BOOKSELLER AND IMPORTER,

77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

Large assortments of the publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Lévy Frères, etc., on hand; also complete lists of Tauchnitz's Collection of British Authors, and Teuner's Greek and Roman Classics. All European periodicals received weekly in parcels.

**Art-work in Silver**  
**The Gorham Company,**

No. 1 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

The most extensive and brilliant collection of rich

**BRIDAL GIFTS,**  
**TESTIMONIAL PIECES,**  
**FAMILY SILVER,**

etc., etc., to be found in the city, now offered at retail at the lowest possible prices.

The Gorham Stamp is an evidence of sterling purity and excellence alike to the purchaser and receiver.

**JAMES TOLMAN & CO.,**  
FINE CUSTOM TAILORING,  
No. 249 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

Respectfully invite attention to their stock of goods for gentlemen's garments. All orders carefully and promptly executed. Location very central, being midway between School and Court Streets.

"THE READER" discusses on page ii.  
a new and remarkable work just published by Macmillan, containing the argument of Science in favor of Immortality, and called "The Unseen Universe."



